

# Classical Philology

VOLUME XX

July 1925

NUMBER 3

## ALLITERATION AND ASSONANCE IN HOMER

By A. SHEWAN

This paper does not pretend to be an exhaustive presentation of the foregoing subject, but only a statement of the principal facts disclosed by an examination of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. As no such statement appears to exist in English, it may be convenient to have a conspectus of the kind with a sufficient number of instances.

The literature of the subject, so far as I am aware, is not very extensive. I know and possess two monographs, Holzapfel's *Ueber den Gleichklang bei Homer* (Berlin, 1851), and Bernhardt's *De Alliterationis apud Homerum usu* (Gotha, 1906), which are occasionally quoted, but probably not very generally known or accessible. Both contain full statements, the former of *Wortklänge* generally, the latter only of initial alliteration and assonance. I have not, however, depended on their enumerations, but have made out lists for myself. I may also refer to Seymour's *Language and Verse*, pages 15 f., and Bekker's *Homerische Blätter*, I, 185 ff., from which I may quote the following sentence, as it describes the phenomena which have engaged my attention. To Homer, he says, *sind alle Wege gerecht worauf ähnliche Töne nahe oder zusammen kommen, Paronomasie Parechese Etymologie Epallelie Epanalepse Epizeuxis, Reim in der Mitte Reim am Ende*.

And recently there has been a new addition to the literature. Early in 1925, just after the manuscript of the present paper was complete, the first two volumes of M. Victor Bérard's Introduction to his edition of the *Odyssey* came to hand, and it was interesting to find

that alliteration and assonance have a prominent place in them. They are even given what is, so far as I am aware, a novel, certainly an unusual, importance, for they are, with the repetitions, the "hapaxes," as the editor calls them, and other indications, used as evidence of interpolation, and many of the lines and parts of lines which I quote as samples figure in disquisitions on the genuineness or spuriousness of certain passages in the poem. The quality of the criterion will no doubt be the subject of criticism in due course, when the six or seven volumes of which the edition is to consist are all available, and cannot be discussed in this paper.

The general question of the nature and use of alliteration and assonance as a quality of style and for poetical effect does not come within my scope, regarding which I may add to Bekker's words already quoted that it includes vowels as well as consonants, and similarities of sounds inside as well as at the beginnings or ends of words, every similarity, in short, that was included by the ancients in the two terms so familiar to readers of Eustathius, *παρήχῃσις* and *παρίσῳσις*. The extent of these in Homer is probably realized but little by the general reader. Here and there he meets a line the alliteration in which can hardly fail to be remarked, but it is only when one takes a page of the text and marks the recurrences of the same sounds, or of sounds of the same class, that one fully appreciates it. One hardly notices that the sound  $\pi$  occurs five times in the third line of the *Iliad*, πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν, or that  $\pi\eta$  δὴ τόνδε μολοβρόν ἄγεις, ἀμέγαρτε συβῶτα; contains five dentals, five labials, and five liquids.<sup>1</sup>

When, however, the matter is closely investigated, one does not wonder that alliteration and assonance abound. They are seen to be almost inevitable. On a count of the sounds—ζ, ξ, and ψ being resolved into their components—in two pages of my Homer containing 64 lines, I find they number 2,090, about equally divided between consonantal (1,089) and vowel (1,001). This gives an average of about 33 sounds to a line. Now there are 21 consonantal and 18 vowel sounds (simple vowels, 7; diphthongs, 11) in the alphabet, or a total

<sup>1</sup> Quotations being so numerous, I have not thought it necessary to give references, except in some cases of passages not quoted *in extenso*. I may add that the digamma is not included, all that concerns that sound in Homer being too doubtful.

of 39. Therefore each sound might, on the average, occur nearly once in a line, but, as some are much more common than others in the vocabulary of the language, the average is in some cases much higher. Thus  $\nu$  and  $\sigma$ , with respectively 179 and 176 occurrences in the 64 lines, have an average of nearly 3, so that, when it happens that there are one or two more than 3 occurrences of either in a line, there must be noticeable alliteration. Similarly,  $\alpha$  has an average of just 3;  $\eta$ , only a little over 1.

It may be of interest here to set down the various sounds in order of frequency of occurrence. For the consonants we have,  $\nu$  179,  $\sigma$  176,  $\tau$  123,  $\pi$  106,  $\rho$  93,  $\delta$  87,  $\kappa$  78,  $\lambda$  70,  $\mu$  66,  $\gamma$  31,  $\phi$  29,  $\theta$  25,  $\chi$  15, and  $\beta$  11. For the vowels,  $\epsilon$  221,  $\alpha$  193,  $\omicron$  145,  $\iota$  111,  $\eta$  70,  $\omega$  58,  $\upsilon$  44,  $\alpha\iota$  34,  $\epsilon\iota$  34,  $\omicron\iota$  30,  $\omicron\upsilon$  23, etc.

Again, there are many words, some very and others fairly common, which have alliteration in themselves, as *κακός, χαλκός, πρόφρων, προ-πάρουθε, ἄλληλοι, πάμπαν, ἐτήτυμος, τρίτατος, κρατερός*, and many mere concords of nouns and adjectives produce it, as *κρατερῇφι βίηφι, ὀδύνῃσι κακῇσι*. The same terminations of nouns, verbs, and adjectives must often recur. An extreme case is O 711-12, where there are 7 occurrences of the termination *-σι*. Then reduplication in perfects and aorists is a fruitful cause, as *ἐτέτυκτο, μεμιγμένον, κεκακωμένον, ἤγαγε, πεπίποιθ'*, and in verbal forms, as *κυκλήσκω, λιλαίομαι, μενείνω, μαρμαίρω, πέμπω, πίπτω, μίμνω*. Add verbs with cognate accusatives, as *βουλὰς βουλεύειν, ξείνους ξεινίζειν, βέλεσιν βεβλήγεται*. Proper names help, as *(περίφρων) Πηνελόπεια, (μενεπτόλεμος) Πολυπόιτης, Σίσυφος, Μυρμιδόνες, Κίκονες (Κίκονες Κικόνεσσι γεγώνευν), Ὠγυγίη, Τάρταρος*, and patronymics, as *Δαρδανίδης* and *Τυδείδης Διομήδης*. There is a good mixture in *Μερμερίδης, ὃς πᾶσι μετέπρεπε Μυρμιδόνεσσι*, and a striking triple combination of  $\pi$  and  $\rho$  in *Πριάμοιο Πάρις κατὰ Περγᾶμον ἄκρης*. For  $\tau$  and  $\rho$  see B 621, and for  $\rho$  alone, the river-names in M 20. In O 274 and 276 there is very decided alliteration in the personal names.

To come now to individual sounds, dental alliteration is extremely common. One sees it cannot be otherwise, when one thinks on the number of constantly recurring particles and other small words, and terminations, containing  $\tau$ , and for  $\delta$ , *δέ, δή, ὅδε*, etc. Lines without a dental are, in fact, very rare. Examples with  $\tau$  prominent are

τίπτε καταπτώσσοντες ἀφέστατε—κύματά τε τροφόμεντα τά τε προσερίνγεται αὐτήν—τί πρῶτόν τοι ἔπειτα τί δ' ὑστάτιον καταλέξω—τιταίνετον ὅττι τάχιστα—with δ, σοὶ δὲ διάνδιχα δῶκε—δεινὰ δ' ὑπόδρα ἰδῶν—with θ, εὖ κατέθηκε λίθον δ' ἐπέθηκε θύρησιν—ἡῖθεοι θαλέθοντες. There is often a mixture, as ἄλλοι δ' ἀνδραπόδεσσι τίθεντο δὲ δαῖτα θάλειαν—ἀγχίμολον δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν ἐδύσετο δώματ' Ὀδυσσεύς—τῷ δ' ἰθὺνθήτην ἐν δὲ ῥυτῆρσι τάνυσθεν. In the first and last examples there are nine dentals in each. In P 201 f. there are sixteen. And here may be mentioned the common proximity of words containing θ and φ, as ἐκ θαλάμοιο φέρον ἐσθῆτα φαεινὴν—ἐτέρφθητε φρέν' ἀέθλους—θυμοφθόρα φάρμακα—ἀμφήλυθε θήλυς αὐτή. Or with χ added, τῷ δ' ἄχος ἀμφεχύθη θυμοφθόρον and φθινύθει δ' ἀμφ' ὀστεόφι χρώς.

Labial alliteration, which is on a par as regards frequency with dental, is mainly due to a number of small words beginning with π and μ, and to certain nouns and adjectives, such as πολὺς, πόλεμος, ἔπος, μέγας. Instances of the predominance of π are πολλοὶ δὲ πρηνεῖς τε καὶ ὑπτιοὶ ἔκπεσον ἵππων—καὶ πηγὰς ποταμῶν καὶ πίσαα ποιήεντα—πᾶσιν δὲ παρὰ ποσὶ κάππεσε θυμός—πᾶρος δ' οὐ πῶ ποτ' ὀπώπει. A notable couplet in which it is combined with ρ is B 414 f. It is followed by τ throughout in πρίν γ' ὅτ' ἂν Αἰγύπτιοι διυπετέος ποταμοῖο. μ abounds in μῆτερ ἐμή, τί νύ μ' οὐ μίμνεις ἑλέιν μεμαῶτα—Ἔκτορι Πριαμίδῃ ἄμοτον μεμαῶτι μάχεσθαι—μάλα γὰρ μέγα μήσατο ἔργον—κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονα μερμήριξα. We have π and μ throughout in πλάζομαι ὧδ' ἐπεὶ οὐ μοι ἐπ' ὄμμασι νήδυμος ὕπνος and τῷ δ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγας πελεμίζετ' Ὀλύμπος, and cf. M 249, ω 39–42, and H 279. There is a mixture of labials in A 756. In Θ 473–75 there are eighteen. The recurrence of the syllable απ (once αβ) is remarkable in ἀψ ὃ γε τὴν ἀπέλυσε λαβὼν ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα.

Some small words such as καί, κε, etc., and some common nouns and adjectives, as χαλκός, κακός, καλός, are responsible for most of the guttural alliteration. As instances, καλὰ παρ' αὐτοῖσι χθονὶ κέκλιτο εὖ κατὰ κόσμον—τοῦ κέρα ἐκ κεφαλῆς ἐκκαϊδεκάδωρα πεφύκει—ἀκέων κίνησε κάρη—κανάχῃσε δὲ χαλκός—κακὸν καὶ κῆρα. In A 351 f. there are fourteen gutturals. Sword and spear produce many instances, δολίχ' ἔγχεα χερσὶν ἔχοντες—ἔλκετο δ' ἐκ κολεοῖο μέγα ξίφος—αἰχμὴ χαλκείῃ—ἔγχος ἔχ' ἐνδεκάπηχυν. Two examples seem to be unique, χύντο χαμαὶ χολάδες and τόξον ἐύξοον ἰξάλου αἰγός.



Alliteration with *ν* is also plentiful, much helped by paragogic *ν* and small words like *ἄν*, *ἐν*, *κεν*, *μιν*, and by certain case and verbal endings. As examples, *τῶν εἴ κεν πάντων ἀντήσομεν ἔνδον ἐόντων—γουνούμην νεκῶν ἀμενῆνὰ κάρηνα—δείπνόν τ' ἐντύνοντο κερῶντό τε αἴθωπα οἶνον—παρενήνεον ἐν κανέοισιν*. There is a peculiar repetition of *αν* in *Ὠκεανὸς ἀνίησιν ἀναψύχειν ἀνθρώπους*. The same syllable is found eight times in the three lines Z 106–8. Another point worth noticing is the frequent combination in assonance of *μ* and *ν*, as *καὶ μέν μιν Δῆμνον εὐκτμένην ἐπέρασσε—τῶν νῦν μοι μνήσαι καὶ μοι νημερτές ἐν-ίσπες—τυρῶν αἰνύμενοι φάγομεν μένομέν τέ μιν ἔνδον—Ἀγαμέμνονι μήνιε—ἐμέθεν μεμνημένος*.

Alliteration with the two liquids proper, *λ* and *ρ*, is less common than with some other classes of consonants, but still frequent. As regards *λ*, it is mostly to be referred to certain common words, *ἄλλος* etc., *μάλα*, *βάλλω*, *δλλυμι*, *λαός*, *φίλος*, etc. Examples are *ἄλλ' ὄλεθ' ὥς ὄφελεν Ἑλένης ἀπὸ φύλον ὀλέσθαι—τῇλε φίλων ἀπόληται ἀλώμενος—Ἑλένη λευκωλένῳ ἄγγελος ἦλθεν—λιγέων ἀνέμων λαιψηρὰ κέλευθα—ἄλγεσι λευγαλέοισι—μάλα λυγρὸς ὄλεθρος*. Many small words contribute to *ρ* alliteration, and common adjectives and nouns such as *κρατερός*, *χείρ*, *κρητήρ*, *χρυσός*, *ἄργυρος*. As examples, *ἔρχευ, ἀτὰρ δόρυ Μηριόνη ἥρωϊ πόρωμεν—ἀργύρεον δ' ἐφ' ὑπερθύρεον χρυσήν δέ κορώνη—ἀργύρεον χρυσέοισιν ἀορτήρεσσιν ἀρηρός—μή τις ἐπ' Ἴρῳ ἦρα φέρων ἐμέ χειρὶ βαρείῃ—τρέμε δ' οὔρεα μακρά—περὶ δουρὶ πεπαρμένῃ*. There is a remarkable combination with *π* in *πυρὸν ἐρεπτόμενοι παρὰ πύελον ἦχι πάρος περ*. The predominance of *ρ* is marked in E 724–29 and κ 348–63, especially 353–59, the descriptions, respectively, of the heavenly war chariot and Kirke's domestic arrangements.

As one of the three consonants in which words end, and as occurring in so many inflections, *σ* of course abounds. Lines in which there are six sibilants—counting *σσ* as one—are common, and there are many with seven. I have marked a number in which there are eight, some of them with these in five feet or less, as *ὥς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτιν—οἴκαδε νοστήσας ἱερῆς εἰς ἄστυ Ζελεΐης*. But it is a remarkable fact that there are few lines in the poems in which, if they are properly read with reference to the sense, the pauses and the back- and forward-leaners, there is any unpleasant sibilation, so skilful is the poet's management and so much is he helped by the marvelous

mechanism of the hexameter. And this though not infrequently the sibilants may almost be said to jostle each other, as *ὑποσχεσίησι πιθήσας*—*πυκινὰς στίχας ἀσπιστῶν*, and even *ὅς τις ἄριστος*. Many lines have no sibilant at all. In A there are twenty-eight such, and a number more that only have one in the last syllable or in an initial *ὥς*. Of deliberate sibilant alliteration there is little trace, as will be seen later on.

Of alliteration with vowels there is not so much to be said, but one or two remarks may be made about their distribution. There are of course many more short vowels than long, because of the great preponderance of dactyls, and because many syllables that are metrically long contain a short vowel. Lines with no long vowel or diphthong remaining long are rare, as *ἐλθόντες μετ' ἄεθλα, περὶ τρίποδος γὰρ ἔμελλον*—*πόντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα φέρον βαρέα στενάχοντα*—*ἀλλ' ἀποχάζεο βόθρου ἄπισχε δὲ φάσγανον ὀξύ*. I have marked fifteen in the poems, but there must be more. Of lines with only one long vowel or diphthong remaining long, there must be on the average three or four to a book. In syllables with the ictus longs preponderate. In the first ictus the proportion of these to vowels lengthened by position is, on a count of about 1,800 lines, nearly 2 to 1. There is sometimes a sudden and complete change from longs to shorts, as *εἰ πῶς οἱ εἴξειαν ὑπασπίδια προβιβάντι*—*ἢ οἱ γαίῶν πολλὴ φιλότατη ἐστὶν ἀπασέων*, but this is not common. The reverse change seems to be rarer still, as *δυσμενέσιν μὲν χάρμα κατηφείην δὲ σοὶ αὐτῷ*.

The heaping up of long vowels and diphthongs in a line or sequence of lines seems to be, as will be noticed later, sometimes for effect. The occurrence of a half-dozen or so in a line is not uncommon. There seem to be some twenty lines in which there are nine. For instances of ten see Z 1, II 636, Σ 418, ο 334. In the last, *σίτου καὶ κρειῶν ἡδ' οἶνον βεβρίθασι*, as in others, some of the diphthongs may be resolved. In one line, ν 130, the only one known to me with so many, there are eleven, all certain—*εὐνῇ καὶ σίτῳ ἢ αὐτῷς κείται ἀκηδῆς*.

Lines or portions of lines in which *a* and its diphthongs are prominent are not infrequent, as *αἰδεῖσθαι ἱερῇα καὶ ἀγλαὰ δέχθαι ἄποινα*—*πολλὰ δὲ φάσγανα καλὰ μελάνδετα κωπήεντα*—*ἀτὰρ ἄψ ἀπιῶν μάλα μέρμερα μῆσατο ἔργα*. In θ 54, as in the famous Ψ 116, there are eleven occurrences of *a*. In B 421–30 the frequency is sustained throughout.

As examples of phrases, ἀλάπαξε φάλαγγας—ἐγκατα καὶ μέλαν αἶμα—οὐτα κατὰ λαπάρην. The syllable *as* is persistent in καὶ πίσυρας κύνεας χαλκήρεας ἵπποδασείας.

The vowel that occurs most frequently is *ε*, and lines in which it abounds are numerous, as ἐξ ἐμέθεν γ' ἐλάσας πεδῖον κἀτα μέρμερα ῥέζε—νῆα μὲν ἔνθ' ἐλθόντες ἐκέλευσαν ἐκ δὲ τὰ μῆλα—ὁ ξείνος ἐμέθεν· ἐθέλω δὲ μιν ἐξερέεσθαι. Cf. K 43. There is initial alliteration, as in ἐς δ' ἐρέτας ἔκρινον ἐείκοσιν ἐς δ' ἐκατόμβην—ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε, and a fondness for combination with *σ*, as φεύξεσθ' ἐν νήεσσι πολυκλήϊσι πεσόντες—ἔσπασεν ἔγχος ὁ δ' ἐσπόμενος πέσε δουρί—προπесόντες ἔρεσσον—κατέσβεσε θεσπιδαῖς πῦρ, and cf. N 264 f. Or with *μ*, as Μέντορι εἰδομένην ἡμὲν δέμας ἥδ' ἐκ αὐδήν—ἔνθα μὲν ἐπτάετες μένον ἐμπεδον—καὶ τέμενος νεμόμεσθα μέγα—νῦν δ' ἐμὲ μὲν μέγα κῦδος.

There is not much concurrence of *ι*. It is found only in a few phrases, as βάσκ' ἴθι, Ἴρι ταχεῖα and τῇ ῥ' Ἀχιλεὺς ἴζεσκε δῖφιλος. In ἄσπῃσι καὶ κορύθεσσι καὶ ἔγχεσι πεφρικνύαι it is the final letter of every word. Sufficient reason for the infrequency is not apparent. Its occurrences are as numerous as 1 to 2 of *ε*, and there are some very common words, *τι*, ὅτι ἐπὶ προτί, etc., which end in it, and there is no lack of terminations of nouns and verbs. The only relevant fact appears to be that as an initial vowel it is, as reference to a Homeric lexicon will show, far less common than *ε* and *α*, and not half as frequent as *ο*.

Examples of lines and sentences in which *ο* and its diphthongs predominate are νόστον πευσόμενος πατὴρ δὴν οἰχομένοιο—ἄκρον ὑπὸ λόφον αὐτόν, ὁ δὲ προσιόντα μέτωπον—ὅθ' ἔδον φίλον νῖδον δρᾶτο—ὦ πόποι αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς τέκος, and cf. N 615 and P 20 f. There is a remarkable alternation of *ο* with *α* in the fine line, παρ ποταμὸν κελάδοντα παρὰ ῥοδανὸν δονακῆα, and there are numerous instances of a similar combination with *ε*, almost to the exclusion of other vowels, as δέονθ' ἡγεμόνος πόθεν γε μὲν ἐσθλὸν ἔοντα—ἐκφερέμεν πολέμοιο τεδὸν φθόγγον ποθέοντε, and cf. E 595.

The least common of the vowels is *υ*, which is prominent in only a few places, as ὠκύαλος νηὺς ἐγγύθεν ὀρυσμένη λιγυρήν δ' ἔντυνον ἄοιδήν—θυμοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς κεκαδὼν κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἀπηύρα—μή μοι σύγχει θυμὸν ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχέων—ἀμφήλυθε θῆλυς αὐτῇ (ἡδὺς αὐτμή)—ὕε δ' ἄρα Ζεὺς συνεχές, and cf. M 164.

The frequency of *η* in a line has been remarked by commentators.

There are many such lines, as εὖ εἶδη σοφίης ὑποθημοσύνησιν Ἀθήνης—ὥς φαμένη καὶ κερδοσύνη ἡγήσατ' Ἀθήνη—αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν πρῶτην ἀκτὴν Ἰθάκης ἀφίκηαι—τῇλ' αὐτῇ πῆληκι κάρη βάλε. Where ω is predominant in a line, it is generally for effect, and the same may be said for some of the diphthongs.

Sometimes there is a sudden change, even in the same line, from one alliteration to another, as in one of the great lines of the *Iliad*, ὥς δ' ὅτε πορφύρεν πέλαγος μέγα κύματι κωφῶ. So in ὀφθαλμῶν μιν ἄμερδε δίδου δ' ἡδεῖαν ἀοιδὴν—πολλῶν πολίων κατέλυσε κάρηνα—τὰ δὲ δράγματα ταρφέα πίπτει, and cf. Γ 47. In α 152 dentals are plentiful, in 153 there are six gutturals. In the first two and one-half lines of ζ 115–17 nearly every word contains a labial; then comes ὁ δ' ἔγρετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς. Or alliterations of two or more kinds are mingled, as in κέκλυτέ μιν μύθων κακὰ περ πάσχοντες ἑταῖροι—αὐτὰρ ὑπὸ κράτεσφι τάπης τετάνυστο φαεινός—τὸ δ' ὑπέρπτατο πίπτει δ' ἔραζε—δίδου δ' ἄρ' ἀθύρματα θυμῶ. This is noticeable (labials and dentals) in A 466–67. Add Θ 221, N 408, E 92–93. And again, symmetry of a quite striking kind may be observed, as in κάπριος ἡὲ λέων στρέφεται σθένει βλεμναίων, where there are four pairs of ε with a consonant between in each case. So ἀλλὰ κλάγξαντος ἄκουσαν—νηὸς ἐνστέλμοιο μελαίνης—παλίντονα τόξα τιταίνων. Cf. H 171. The symmetry is of a chiasmic nature in αὐχένα τε στιβαρὸν καὶ στήθεα λαχνήεντα. In μήτηρ μὲν μοὶ φησι φίλη πινυτή περ ἐοῦσα the consonants might have been arranged with deliberation. There is quite extraordinary alteration, μ five times with a dental between each pair, in θυμῶ τολμήεντι μετὰ Τρῶας μεγαθύμους.

There are a number of other matters not far removed from the subject proper of this paper, which have attracted my attention when searching the poems, and which may have mention here, especially as they are mostly points about which not much is to be found in the books. There is rhyme. It is not uncommon between the two hemistichs of a verse with the third trochee, as in the notable ἐν δ' ἐτίθει ποταμοῖο μέγα σθένος Ὀκεανοῖο, or inside the first part of a hephthemimeral line, as Πηλεΐδης ἀπὸ πυρκαϊῆς or ἀργύρεον δ' ἐφ' ὑπερθύριον. There may be even three rhymes in a line, ἐξ Ἑνεῶν ὅθεν ἡμιόνων γένος ἀγροτεράων. Such rhyming is apparently unintentional, and was evidently not objectionable to ancient taste. The same may be said

of the homoioteleuta, or lines ending with the same or very similar syllables. These are quite common; how common one does not realize until one marks them throughout the poems. That a number of successive lines end in *ν* or *ς* cannot of course surprise us, but there are many pairs that end in *οι*, *αι*, *ας*, *εσθαι*, *οντα*, etc. Homoioteleuta in *ω*, *φ*, *ων* are very common. In ε 156–60 there are five lines ending in *ων*, and these are followed by one in *ω* and another in *φ*. Cf. O 688–92. Not infrequently we find the same word, 'Αχαιῶν, Ἀοιδῆν, πονέεσθαι, or with a difference in the inflection, γαίη-αν, κούρης-ην, and so on.

A modern writer would avoid such assonances, but the classical ear, even the ear of an artist in words such as Sophocles, was, as Jebb has remarked, not so fastidious. There are homoioteleuta of the kind noted by him on *Ajax* 807 f. He also remarks, on 61 of the same play, on "the harsh combination of sounds [as we should think it]" in *κάπειτ' ἐπειδή*, and adds that it is not rare. Certainly Homer had no such feeling when he wrote, *ἐπεὶ πείθεσθαι—ἔταροι οἷ οἱ—πάν δ' ἡμαρ μάρναντο—ἐρίγδουπος πόσις—στάντων μὲν Μενέλαος—γῆς ἀλγίσετε—οἱ δ' ἐκβήσαντες ἔβησαν*. In successive lines, and even at the same part of the verse, there is sometimes a repetition of syllables which a modern author would carefully avoid. The termination *-οντας* occurs four times in Δ 294–96, *-οντο* three times in E 700–702, and *-ουσιν* twice in Φ 465 f. And see the recurrence of *-ηκε* in Φ 572–75, and cf. 'Οδυση- in Γ 123 f.

As another instance of the same kind, a *θ* assonance is one rather obnoxious to a modern ear. In Homer we have such instances as *δηθὰ θεῶν, προπάρουθε θυράων*, though not many. In *ἐν στήθεσσι θεοὶ θέσαν* we have three, and in *ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε θεὰ Θέτις* we have four occurrences of this consonant in close proximity. The poet seems to have been careless of the cacophony. Eustathius, with his commendable desire to omit nothing that requires remark, frequently comments on such conjunctions as *ὀλισθε θέων, Αἴθη θῆλυς, ἔργα γάμοιο*, and in such cases sometimes even detects *κάλλος τι*. Of the phrase *πολλῶν ἐκ πολίων* he says *κάλλος τι ἔχει παρηχητικόν*. Cf. his remarks on the repeated words and endings in A 141–43, and the general statement (on Z 201 f.), *τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἱλαρύναντος διὰ παρηχησέως καὶ παρισωσέως τὴν ἱστορικὴν σκυθρωπότητα*. But in regard to cacophonies generally,

as we regard them, it is noticeable how few really harsh combinations of consonants inside words are to be found in Homer. *θύσθλα* is to my ear about the worst. Other bad instances are *ἐφθιθεν*, *ἐθέλχθης*, *ἐγχεριμφθείς*, and even *δγχη*.

Another fault, as some might deem it in these days, to which Homer was indifferent, was a certain monotony caused by a succession of words ending in the same letter or syllable. As regards consonants, such sequences could not but be common, since there are only three that can be final in a word. There is never any plethora of the rarer ending in *ρ*. As to *ς*, a series of words ending in it is not uncommon. In a few instances, as A 489 and K 467, every word has final *ς*. *ν* is in much the same case, but it is not a sound that lends itself much to alliterative effect, even when it ends every word in a line, as *ἄξομεν ἐν νήεσσιν ἐπὴν πολίεθρον ἔλωμεν*, though in *ἦγον ἐποψόμενον Τιτυόν, Γαίηϊον νιόν*, the final sound of each word, helped by the triple *ο* in the second word, is somewhat obtrusive. As regards vowels, there are a few lines in which all words end in them, as *στήθεά θ' ἱμερόεντα καὶ ὄμματα μαρμαίροντα*, or *ναυτιλίῃ καὶ ποσσὶ καὶ ὄρχηστνὶ καὶ ᾠδοῖν*, and there may even be initial vowels throughout a line, as *οὐκέτ' ἔπειτ' οἶω οὐδ' ἄγγελον ἀπονέεσθαι*, but such are rare and hardly call for remark. It may be added that in Homer words ending in a vowel are not largely in excess of those ending in a consonant. A great excess might have been expected, but paragoge *ν* and elision reduce it very much.

Another point may be referred to here, the repetition of a word or phrase—not those *Wiederholungen*, or recurrences of the same word, phrase, sentence, or passage in two or more places, which formerly were, and still to some extent are, prized by dissectors for their own purposes, but repetitions of the same word or phrase in the same line or in one or two consecutive lines. These repetitions are of several kinds. They may involve merely common phraseology, *ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα*—*ἄλλοτε . . . ἄλλοτε*—*ἄλλνδῖς ἄλλη*—*ἄλλοι δ' ἀμφ' ἄλλησι*, or only a repeated *οὐ* or *οὐτε*, as *οὐ δέμας οὐτε φνὴν, οὐτ' ἄρ φρένας οὐτε τι ἔργα*, or nothing more than a *τε*, as in *καλὸς τε μέγας τε* or *εἰδὸς τε δέμας τε*. In another class of cases a noun or adjective is evidently repeated for effect, as *ἀπὸ χαλκὸφι χαλκός*—*εἰλομένων, εἴλει δέ—κακὸν κακῷ ἐστήρικτο*—*ἐφ' ἑλκεῖ ἑλκος*—*μέγας μεγαλωστί*—*ὄνομ' ἔστω*



ἐπώνυμον—τῷ δὲ φρένας ἄφρονι πείθε—οὔτιδανός Οὔτις. See the famous example in N 130 f., and cf. Ξ 382. It may be merely the initial letter or syllable, as εὐβοτος εὐμηλος—ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος—ὄψιμον ὄψιτελεστον. Add the type οἶδθεν οἶος—αἰνόθεν αἰνώς. The initial ἐκ in each of the four lines A 436-39 has been objected to as the work of an intruding *Stümper*, but it can easily be paralleled, and not in Greek poetry alone. Cf. the four occurrences of ἐν in E 740 f. We can estimate the determination of Zeus, now rousing himself to afflict the Achaeans, by emphasis of the kind in his speech in the opening of Θ. See lines 5, 7, 20, 24, 27. Or lastly, the repetition may be to point a contrast, as in Ἀχαιῖδες οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοί—ὄλλυντάς τ' ὄλλυμένους τε—ἐκὼν ἀέκοντα—ἀκμήτες κεκμηότας—μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσιν, ἀμείλικτον δ' ὅπ' ἄκουσαν. To which may be added instances of epanalepsis, as the famous εἰ πυρὶ χεῖρας ἔοικε of Υ 371 f. Cf. X 127 f. and Ψ 371 f.

Homer, like another supreme poet, Shakespeare, did not scorn the humble pun. It is a weakness—as it is considered in these days—that has not attracted much attention from Homeric scholars. Gladstone says in his *Primer* (p. 151) that not less than a dozen instances of paronomasia may be found in the poems. The Οὔτις—μή τις joke is notorious, as is the description of the spear of Peleus from Pelion, which Achilles alone ἐπίστατο πῆλαι. The hemistich δάμασσε δέ μιν μεμαῶτα, which occurs elsewhere, certainly comes in pat in the case of Damasos, M 186. The neatest instance in the poems seems to be in the description of Proteus and his seals, when the Old Man of the Sea first λέκτο δ' ἀριθμόν . . . ἔπειτα δὲ λέκτο καὶ αὐτός. Sometimes the paronomasia is more extended, as in certain passages in which μάλα and μαλακός are brought together, as ὕδρηλοι μαλακοί, μάλα κ' ἄφθιτοι ἄμπελοι εἶεν, with μάλα again in each of the two following lines. Also, ἦ με μάλ' αἰνοπαθῇ μαλακὸν περὶ κῶμ' ἐκάλυψε, and ὦ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δὴ μαλακώτερος ἀμφαφάσθαι ἔκτωρ. At times there is what may really be called a mere jingle, and one apparently of a deliberate kind. Examples with κακός are κάκον κεκακωμένον—οὐ κε κακοὶ τοιοῦσδε τέκονεν—καὶ σύ, κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασμένε. Others are καὶ τε κτανέοντα κατέκτα—ἐπεὶ κε τέκωσι τοκῆς—εἰ τις ἔτ' ἔσται μῆτις—ὀλίγον γόνυ γουνὸς ἀμείβων. A notable instance is νῦν αὖτε νόον νίκησε νεοίη, which recalls βουλή δὲ κακὴ νίκησεν ἐταίρων. In τοῦτον μαινόμενον, τυκτὸν κακόν, ἀλλοπρόσαλλον there is very prominent alliteration in every



word. On all which it may be observed that, if Homer did not disdain to admit such iteration to his verse, it is possible enough that much of his alliteration and assonance is not the result of merely fortuitous collocation of the same or similar sounds.

Gladstone has said that "Homer is wonderful in his adaptation of sound and sense," and this is apparent in the repeated use of certain consonants. Gutturals often give an unpleasant connotation. *κακός* figures in a number of phrases, as *κάκ' ἐλέγχεα—κακαὶ κύνες—κυνὸς κακομηχάνου ὀκρυέντος*—and *κακοῖσι δόλοισι* already quoted. Other examples are *ἐχθρῆς ἐκ κεφαλῆς—γῆρας λυγρὸν ἔχεις αὐχμῆς τε κακῶς—δίψῃ καρχαλέοι κεκοιμημένοι*. Cf. Z 458. The effect is helped by *ρ* in *αἰψηρός δὲ κόρος κρυεροῖο γόοιο*. In another set of cases the gutturals, often with *ρ*, are frequent in descriptions of cutting, breaking, or smashing, as *ἐκ πυκινῆς δ' ὕλης πτόρθον κλάσε χειρὶ παχείῃ—καλάμην χθονὶ χαλκὸς ἔχευε—ἄχρις ἄραξε—τρίχας ἔλκετο χειρὶ—ἀντικρὺ χροῖα τε ῥήξω σὺν τ' ὅστέ' ἀράξω—χερμαδίῳ κεφαλῇ, ἣ δ' ἀνδιχα πᾶσα κεάσθη*. Cf. N 124 and Θ 328 f. The beaks and claws of birds seem to be pointedly described by *αἰγυπιοὶ γαμφώνυχες ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι*.

Similar effects from labials and dentals are not so prominent or frequent. Quick or repeated movement—cf. our "pit-a-pat" or "rub-a-dub"—seems to be reflected by the fifteen labials in ζ 115–17 (ball play), and by the nine in *κούφα ποσὶ προβιβὰς καὶ ὑπασπίδια προποδίζων*, and cf. N 798–800 and 806–7. Frequency also seems to be suggested by the mere sound of the dentals in *τὰ δὲ δράγματα ταρφέα πίπτει*. It may be too fanciful to see the dotting of the stars about the firmament in *ἐν δὲ τὰ τεῖρεα πάντα τὰ τ' οὐρανὸς ἐστεφάνωται*, or some tenderness in *ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἔοντα*, in regard to which Leaf's note on *τέκνα* and *τέκε* in B 311–5—five lines containing thirty dentals—may be referred to.

The consonant *ρ* is frequent in descriptions of flowing water. The word *ῥέω* is conspicuous in about a dozen epithets of *ποταμός*. There is a full description of a flowing river in *στήν' ἐπ' ὠκυρόῳ ποταμῷ ἄλαδε πορρέοντι, ἀφρῷ μορμύροντα ἰδών*. Cf. Σ 402 f. and Φ 325. And *προΐει καλλίρροον ὕδωρ—καθύπερθεν ἐπιρρέει—χείμαρροι ποταμοὶ κατ' ὄρεσφι ῥέοντες* may be added, and of blood flowing from a wound, *ῥέει δ' ἄμβροτον αἷμα θεοῖο, ἕχωρ οἶός περ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσι*. Allied to this is the notion of fluttering or wriggling, as in *αἰεὶ δ' ὀπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν*

φρένες ἡρέθονται, and ὡς οἱ γ' ἀσπαίροντες αἰέροντο προτὶ πέτρας, of victims struggling like a fish at the end of a line. But *ρ* has also a very different set of associations, being much in evidence in references to forcible, noisy, or difficult action, and breaking or tearing, as γέντο δὲ χειρὶ ραιστήρα κρατερὴν ἐτέρηφι δὲ γέντο πυράγρην—κόρυθα κροτάφοις ἀραρυῖαν κρατὸς ἀφαρπάξαι, and cf. T 380 f.—οἱ ῥ' ἀπὸ πετράων ἀνδραχθέσι χερμαδιοῖσι, where the gutturals help, and cf. ε 434 f.—σφαραγεῦντο δὲ οἱ πυρὶ ῥίξαι—πέτρον μάρμαρον ὀκριενθ'—ἦ ῥα καὶ ἀμφοτέρας ἐπὶ καρπῷ χεῖρας ἔμαρπτε. And see M 52–54, where *ρ* appears in two and one-half lines descriptive of the terror of the horses at the fosse. But there is the opposite effect, if effect it can be called, in Θ 179, ἵπποι δὲ ῥέα τάφρον ὑπερβορέονται ὀρυκτὴν. Gutturals and *ρ* are noticeably abundant in Λ 25–28, the description of Agamemnon's corslet.

As regards *σ*, it is a consonant, the critics tell us, which the poets avoid, and they are hard on offenders. I may refer to a letter in the *Times Literary Supplement* of January 10, 1922. Sibilants can be deliberately heaped together only when a very unpleasant effect is intended. There can be little doubt of that in X 348, ὡς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς σῃς γε κύνας κεφαλῇς ἀπαλάλκοι, where we are at the culmination of Achilles' vengeance. Cf. a similar reference to the ultimate fate of the Wooers in the *Odyssey*, τίσασθαι μνηστήρας ὑπερβασίης ἀλεγεινῆς. In Ω 201–8 (Hecuba in her fury) there are thirty-seven sibilants in eight lines. Cf. ρ 449–51 (Antinoos in a rage). Of a different kind is ὡς τοῦ σιζ' ὀφθαλμός. On the other hand, in Z 484, δακρυόεν γέλασσα, πόσις δ' ἐλέησε νοήσας, there are seven sibilants in four feet, but obviously not with any intent.<sup>1</sup>

The long vowels and diphthongs can be used for effect. In one class of cases I think there can be no doubt of the poet's intention, those in which a solemn warning is conveyed, or wonder, admiration, or surprise is expressed. The instances of a succession of spondees in the first hemistich containing long vowels or diphthongs are numerous enough to prove intention. See σ 79 (Antinoos to Iros), νῦν μὲν μήτ' εἴης, βουγάϊε, and the similar openings of 83 and 84, and Θ 402 (Zeus threatening), γινώσω μὲν σφωῶν. For wonder or the like, οὐ γάρ

<sup>1</sup> On this, reference may be made to Professor Scott's papers in *Amer. Jour. Philol.*, Vols. XXIX and XXX.

πω τοίους ἵππους ἴδον, and cf. B 799—τοῦ δὴ καλλίστους ἵππους ἴδον, and cf. λ 309. Or a bit of senile swagger, τὸν δὴ κάρτιστον καὶ μήκιστον κτάνον ἄνδρα. Or the opening of a solemn promise, αἶ κέν μοι δῶῃ Ζεὺς, or a prayer for vengeance, as in ι 523–25, where each of the lines begins in this way. Similarly, in the warning of Theoklymenos in υ 351–57, in every one of the seven lines the first syllable contains a long vowel or diphthong, and it is much the same in 364–70. As a contrast, a passage in lighter vein may be cited. In B 211–20 (the description of Thersites) every one of the ten lines begins with a syllable containing a short vowel made long by position.

The syllable *ων* is frequently used with great effect. There is verily the *δοῦπος ἀκόντων* in *βαλλομένων σακέων τε καὶ ἵπποκόμων τρυφαλειῶν*, and something even more impressive in *ἀνδρῶν τ' ὀλλυμένων νηῶν θ' ἅμα ἀγνυμένων*. Cf. N 5f. and 341–43. Eustathius' comment on *δρυτόμων ἀνδρῶν ὀρυμαγδὸς ὀρώρει* is *ἐπίτηδες καὶ νῦν ἐτράχυνε τὴν φράσιν ἀναλόγως τῷ πράγματι*. *ου* seems to be used to denote a dull, heavy sound in the familiar *δούπησεν δὲ πεσών* or *δεδονπότος Οἰδιπόδαο*, or *μυκηθμοῦ δ' ἤκουσα βοῶν αὐλιζομένων*, where the pronunciation of *ου* that is or used to be general in England would rather suggest cats. There is weight in the line *σίτου καὶ κρειῶν καὶ οἴνου βεβρίθασιν*, and the substitution of *οο* for *ου* would spoil it. *ει* seems to have a suitable sound in *νικεῖν βασιλῆας ὀνειδείους ἐπέεσσιν* or *κατηφείη καὶ ὀνειδος*, or again when combined with *ρ* in some effort or display of strength, as *ἐρείσατο* (*εἵλετο*) *χειρὶ παχείῃ—ῥήρειστο—θρασειῶν ἀπὸ χειρῶν*—or even in the familiar formula *οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' ἐτοίμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἵαλλον*. Meals in those days made up in quantity what was lacking in quality, and men sat down to them to satisfy their hunger and to eat until it was gone (*ἔρον ἔντο*). *αι* has a plaintive suggestion in the opening of Eumaeus' prayer, *νύμφαι κρηναῖαι, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο*, and in the wail of Andromache, *αἰόλαι εὐλαι ἔδονται ἐπεὶ κε κύνες κορέσωνται*. Cf. ι 523, already referred to. The same diphthong predominates in the striking line, *βάλλ'· αἰεὶ δὲ πυραὶ νεκρῶν καίοντο θαμειαί*. As regards *οι*, there are lines in which it abounds, as Z 177, 248, β 340, λ 293, but apparently with no particular significance. There is a remarkable repetition of the syllable *αντ*, always with the ictus, in A 133, *ἦ ἐθέλεις, ὄφρ' αὐτὸς ἔχῃς γέρας, αὐτὰρ ἔμ' αὐτῶς*. . . . One may see in it the rising temper of Aga-

memnon, just as his repetition of the same thing four times in different words in 287-89 shows it at its height and beyond his control.

Yet again, there seem to be instances in which a letter in a word produces similar sounds throughout a line or in a great part of it. A prominent example is the language regarding feasts and feasting, in which the frequency of dentals appears to be due to the  $\delta$  of *daís*, etc. The familiar formula, *δαίνυντ'*, οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδέετο δαιτὸς εἴσης, is conspicuous in this respect. Cf. *δήεις δὲ διοτρεφέας βασιλῆας δαίτην δαινυμένους—δαίτης ἡντήσατε δεῦρο μολοντες—τετύκοντό τε δαῖτ' ἐρατεινὴν—ἦλθε θεοῦ ἐς δαῖτα θάλειαν—τίθεντο δὲ δόρπον (δαῖτα θάλειαν). πόλις* affords examples of alliteration so striking that it can hardly be ascribed to chance, as *πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Πριάμοιο πόλις μέροπες ἄνθρωποι πάντες μυθέσκοντο πολύχρυσον πολύχαλκον—πιείρας πέρθοντε πόλεις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων—ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων*. Both labials and dentals seem to follow *πατήρ*, as in *πατρί τε σῶ μέγα πῆμα πόλῃ τε πάντι τε δήμῳ—πάσσε τά οἱ ποτε πατρί φίλα φρονέων πόρε Χείρων—πατρί τε σῶ Τελαμῶνι ὃ σ' ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἔοντα—πατήρ ἅμα πομπὸν ὅπασσε*. So for *πεδίον*, *ῥῖξεν πεδίοιο ποσὶ κραινοῖσι πέτεσθαι—πλῆτο δὲ πᾶν πεδίον πεζῶν τε καὶ ἵππων*. We might compare *ἑπτα δ' ἐπέσχε πέλεθρα πεσών*. Examples would probably be supplied by *πολύς*. In *πάντη παπταίνοντι πρὸς ἡρωειδέα πέτρην* the alliteration may be the effect of the verb. Cf. our "peer" and "peer." A consonant in a word seems sometimes to attract epithets containing it. *Λιμὴν* has *κλυτός, ναύλοχος, γλαφυρός, κοῖλος, χαλεπός, καλός*. In one line  $\lambda$  is conspicuous, *ἐν λιμέσι χαλεποῖσι, μόγισ δ' ὑπάλυξεν ἀέλλας*, where *χθαμαλοῖσι* and *γλαφυροῖσι* have been conjectured. *ἄρουρα* is remarkable in this respect. We have *ζείδωρος, ἐρίβωλος, πείρα* and *πατρὶς ἄρουρα—οὔθαρ and οὔρον ἀρούρης—ἀπουρίσσουσιν ἀρούρας—ἀνδρὸς μάκαρος κατ' ἄρουραν*. The epithets of *Ἄρης* show the same tendency, as *θοῦρος, στυγερός, ὄβριμος, κρατερός, βροτολογός*. So in the line *οἷ τε πανημέριοι στυγερῶ κρίνονται Ἄρηϊ*. The effect of the  $\rho$ , in combination with  $\lambda$ , seems to change in the second half of another line, *Ἄρηϊ κρατερῶ, ὃ δὲ οἱ παρελέξατο λάθρη*. The simplicity of the enterprise to a god seems to be suggested, and we almost look for the usual combination, *ρεῖα μάλ' ὥς τε θεός*. The  $\rho$  in the name of the god is very prominent in *ἦρχε γὰρ Ἄρης ῥινότορος καὶ πρῶτος Ἀθηναίη ἐπόρουσε*. As a last instance, the epithets of

ὑπνος may be referred to, all containing its initial letter, ἡδύς, ἡδυμος, γλυκύς, γλυκερός, πάννυχος, and λυσιμελής and λύων μελεδήματα θυμοῦ in exquisite lines. ἡδυμος ἀμφιχυθείς and γλυκὺν ὑπνον ἔχευε may also be added.

And lastly, in the epic commonplace, as it is called, there seems to be a decided tendency to alliteration. For the formulas a few instances may be quoted. Observe the alternation of labials, liquids, and gutturals in χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόῳ ἐπέχευε φέρουσα, or of labials, liquids, and dentals in τόφρα μάλ' ἀμφοτέρων βέλε' ἤπτετο, πίπτε δὲ λαός. There is much the same in ποσσὶ δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσιν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα. Gutturals are numerous in ἔνθα κε λοιγὸς ἔην καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα γέγοντο, and in εἶλετο δ' ἄλκιμον ἔγχος ἀκαχμένον ὀξεί χαλκῷ. Other common formulas with the same peculiarity are δούπησεν δὲ πεσών κ.τ.λ.—τόν δ' ἡμίβετ' ἔπειτα πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς—τόν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη κρατερὸς Διομήδης. A standing epic "run," such as a description of a sacrifice (A 458 ff.) or a voyage (A 479 ff.) abounds in alliteration. The plethora of ρ's in Δ 134-40 may be compared. The same thing is observable in regard to the epithets. It is apparent in many single words, as χαλκοκορυστής, καλλίκομος, μενεπτόλεμος, περίφρων, ποντοπόρος, and in epithets consisting of two words, as μητέρα μήλων, κάρη κομόωντες, or in two in juxtaposition, as θρασυμέμονα θυμολέοντα, πολυπύρου ποιήεντος, ἄφθιτον ἄστερόεντα, ἀρρήκτους ἀλύτους. And especially in the epithet combined with the name of the person, place, or object, as Διομήδεις ἱπποδάμοιο, φίλε Φοῖβε, αἶπὺν Ὀλύμπου, Ἀραιθυρέην ἐρατεινήν, διΐπετέος ποταμοῖο. There is triple repetition in Ἐρμεία, Διὸς νιέ, διάκτορε, δῶτορ ἑάων. And finally there are the stock phrases, in great number, τριχθαί τε καὶ τετραχθαί, μέρμερα ἔργα, οὐρανὸν εὐρύν, πρότερος προσέειπε, ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας, ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, and many others.

The foregoing are the results of my examination, and I can hardly hope to carry the matter farther, but I venture to suggest that it will be found to involve points worthy of fresh exploration, and perhaps suitable for presentation as theses for academical degrees. Probably there is more to be discovered. For example, it seems possible, considering the part that assonance played in the early poetry of Northern Europe, that some connection may be discoverable between the alliter-

ation and assonance in the poems and a northern origin for the Greek epic. Again, Bérard's views on the subject, already referred to, constitute a topic for consideration. In other directions minute inquiry may be profitable. Instances might usefully be scrutinized and classified according to the position of the alliteration or the assonance in the verse with reference to the ictus, or in the individual word, according as it is initial, final, or otherwise. And so on. I may add that, so far as my observation has gone, there does not appear to be anything similar to what has been discovered for Latin poetry in Evans' *Alliteratio Latina*, but I am far from saying that there is nothing of the kind.

The principal point of interest appears to be whether, and to what extent, the assonance and alliteration were deliberately intended. The impression left with me is that, while much of it is due to the simple fact that the same sound was, in the ordinary course, bound to recur to an extent that produces the effect, much, on the other hand, seems to be attributable to set purpose on the part of the poet. Many of the instances cited suggest this of themselves, but we have also other phenomena which have been noted above, and especially the epic commonplace, which, I venture to add, would appear to take the practice back to a time far anterior to the poems themselves. Bergk notes, in his *History of Greek Literature* (p. 102), that alliteration is frequent in *Spruchwörtern und stehenden Redensarten, besonders aber in formelhaften Ausdrücken die auf alter Ueberlieferung beruhen*. Just so for early English literature I read that "all the old customary phraseologies of poetry had been molded on that principle."<sup>1</sup> And generally I find myself in accord with Holzapfel when he says, *Homer liebt diese malende Musik der Wortklänge*. Bérard, however, as will have been gathered from what I have said above, distinguishes.<sup>2</sup> The poet, he says (unlike the foolish and unscrupulous interpolator), *Sait n'user de la paréchèse, en général, et de la rime en particulier qu'avec mesure et dans le ton héroïque*, and preserves always *le respect de la raison et le souci du ton héroïque*.

ST. ANDREWS

<sup>1</sup> Craik, *English Literature*, I, 225.

<sup>2</sup> *Introduction*, I, 412.

## ORNITHIACA

BY CAMPBELL BONNER

### I. FOWLER'S MAGIC IN ARISTOPHANES' *Birds* 1081

It is a wise caution to all who would apply folklore to the explanation of classical texts, that the resources of ancient tradition should be exhausted before one has recourse to the analogies of modern custom. But now and then folklore solves what philology leaves obscure. Such a case occurs in a familiar passage of Aristophanes' *Birds*.

In the epirrhema of the second parabasis, verses 1077-83, the "Bird-Chorus" proclaim a hue and cry against a certain Philocrates, a fowler and seller of birds:

ἦν ἀποκτείνει τις ἡμῶν Φιλοκράτη τὸν Στροίθιον,  
λήψεται τάλαντον, ἦν δὲ ζῶντά γ' ἀγάγη, τέτταρα,  
ὅτι συνείρων τοὺς σπίνους πωλεῖ καθ' ἑπτά τοῦ βολοῦ,  
εἶτα φουσῶν τὰς κίχλας δαίκνυσι καὶ λυμαίνεται,  
τοῖς τε κοψίχοισιν ἐς τὰς ῥίνας ἔγχει τὰ πτερά,  
τὰς περιστεράς θ' ὁμοίως ξυλλαβὼν εἰρξας ἔχει,  
κάπανα γὰρ κᾶζει παλεῦνιν δεδεμένους ἐν δικτύῳ.

The particular line with which we are concerned is 1081, "Into the nostrils of the blackbirds he thrusts their feathers." Here, first of all, a verbal peculiarity demands attention, namely, the use of *ἐγχεῖ*, literally, "pours in," instead of *ἐμβάλλει*, *ἐντίθησι*, or *ἐμβυνέει*. The scholiast remarks upon the forced use of the word, and some editors are so dissatisfied with it that they propose various emendations—*ἐντιθεῖ πτερά* (Meineke), *εἶρει τὰ πτερά* or *ἐγχρίει πτερά* (Kock), *ἐμβυνέει πτερά* (Blaydes), *εἰς τῶ ῥῖν' ἐνείρει τὰ πτερά* (van Leeuwen). I cannot think that these conjectures merit serious discussion. The best explanation of the choice of the word is that it is a witticism *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, perhaps for *ὄξος*. A line of the *Frogs* (620) shows that pouring vinegar into the nostrils was a form of torture which might be inflicted upon slaves. This is Blaydes's view of the word, although, as we have seen, he doubts the integrity of the text.



The question with which we are concerned is, Why did the bird-catcher put feathers into the blackbirds' nostrils? The scholia contain three answers. First: "Blackbirds, when laying, prick their eggs; so fowlers put feathers on their bills to blunt them by the softness of the feathers." Obviously this explanation is absurd when applied to wild birds; but it may be a notion derived from some practice of poulterers, perhaps intended to cure egg-eating hens of their vice. Some modern parallels, which will be cited later, make this very probable. It is just possible that the error may have been made easier by the fact that a certain black breed of hens was called by the name of *κόσσυφος*, or "blackbird," according to Pausanias.<sup>1</sup>

The second statement of the purpose of inserting the feather is "that they may not suffer from coryza [pip]." Here again the conjecture lies ready to hand that the scholiast is stupidly transferring to wild birds something that properly has to do with domesticated ones. This guess I have been able to confirm from the two Byzantine treatises on falconry which Hercher printed at the back of his Teubner edition of *Aelian*. These books are largely taken up with the ailments of hawks and the proper treatment of them; and in each there is a prescription directing that in cases of coryza among the falcons a medicine be inserted into the nostrils by means of a feather.<sup>2</sup>

The third explanation, stated in two different notes, is that the feather was inserted as a means of stringing the birds together and hanging them up to display them for sale. Certainly not a very convenient device. One might imagine a country lad taking a single bird and carrying his catch home in this fashion; but for the display in front of a dealer's shop, the contrivance would hardly commend itself.

Modern editors have contributed little to explain the passage; most of them appear to be content with the scholiast's notion that the fowler thrust in the feathers in order to hang the birds up by them. So Green and van Leeuwen. Rogers thinks that the feathers were inserted merely for ornament, and so, apparently, did Rudd, whose translation, "He will dress their noses, putting feathers in their bills," is quoted by Green. Perhaps they had in mind some such fancy as

<sup>1</sup> ix. 22. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Demetrius of Constantinople, *Hierakosophion* 106 (Hercher, *op. cit.*, p. 410); anonymous *Orneosophion* 71 (Hercher, *op. cit.*, p. 548).

that of the old-time cooks, who, when dressing a sucking pig to be roasted for the table, used to place a red apple in the animal's mouth. Merry says:

No sensible explanation is offered of this insertion of feathers into the nostrils of blackbirds. It may be suggested that the Athenian poulterer resorted to a practice not unknown to our country lads, of killing small birds by passing one of their own quill-feathers up the nostril to the brain.

That so cruel a practice existed is, unfortunately, likely enough; but it does not seem to explain the passage adequately, and, as will be seen presently, a better explanation can be found.

When I last read the *Birds* with a group of students, one of the members of the class was Mr. Midas G. Perros, a graduate of the University of Michigan, who was born and spent all his boyhood in the island of Cythera, and who has kept in mind many interesting bits of the folklore of that place. When we reached this passage, I could only call attention to the unsatisfactory explanations of the feather custom which had been offered up to that time; whereupon Mr. Perros said, "We used to do that in Cythera." Naturally I pressed him for a fuller account of the matter, which is as follows.

The men and boys of Cythera, like most Mediterranean folk, are much given to catching small migratory birds, sometimes in traps, sometimes with a baited hook and line. Among those which are most commonly taken by the latter method are blackbirds, or *merles* (*Turdus merula*), which are the *κόψιχοι* or *κόσσυφοι* of the ancient Greeks, and are now known as *κότζυφοι*. When one of these birds is caught, it is customary to pluck a long feather from the wing or tail and thrust it across the beak through the nostrils. Mr. Perros said that his elder brother, who taught him the rite, warned him that if he neglected it he would catch no more birds. The same thing was done with thrushes (*κίχλαι*, *τζίχλαις*), which are caught in traps, and with several kinds of shrikes, or butcherbirds, which are caught in fall-traps with a grasshopper for bait.

At my suggestion, Mr. Perros confirmed his recollection of the custom by inquiry among other Greeks of his acquaintance, with interesting results. A young man from Corfu knew and had practiced the custom just as Mr. Perros had; another, a native of Cythera, added one or two details. As he knew the custom, only the first bird captured

was treated in this peculiar manner; and the feather used was always a long quill plucked from the right wing. On the other hand, two town-bred youths, one from Tripolis in Arcadia, the other from Constantinople, knew nothing of the custom as applied to wild birds; but both had seen the feather inserted through the nostrils as a device to discourage a broody hen. Just such, or very similar, had been the experience of the puzzled scholiast of the *Birds*; and our guess that he was ignorantly transferring to wild birds what he had learned of poulterers' customs in managing domestic fowls is made virtually certain. A slight variation in this absurd practice of the modern poulterer has been brought to my attention by the kindness of Dr. Warren E. Blake, of the University of Vermont. A Mexican servant has been known to thrust a feather through the nostrils of a turkey-cock, in order, by diverting his attention(!), to prevent him from fighting with the other fowls.<sup>1</sup>

There should be no doubt now that in our passage Aristophanes is alluding to an old magical practice current among fowlers, and intended to insure continued success in bird-catching. Since such practices usually persist long after the exact reason for them is forgotten, it may be doubted whether the poet himself could have told more about the matter than I learned from the student from Cythera. Here, then, for the ordinary purpose of exegesis, the matter might rest.

But in order to do full justice to the subject, it seems necessary to follow the problem a little farther, and, if possible, bring the custom attested by Aristophanes into connection with others of similar origin. We should ask why this childish custom was believed to bring further success in hunting or trapping birds.

It seems to be a common and widely distributed custom among primitive peoples to mutilate the game killed in hunting in one way or another, such mutilation having no relation to the necessary process of cutting up the flesh for food. The motive for the mutilation is variously stated; but in some cases it is evidently performed out of fear of some untoward consequences to the hunter, which would ensue if it were neglected. In the case of a powerful and ferocious beast, it may be designed to prevent the ghost of the animal from wreaking its vengeance upon its slayer. With weak and timid creatures, it may

<sup>1</sup> C. M. Flandrau, *Viva Mexico!*, p. 113. New York: Appleton, 1910.

be to keep the ghost of the slain animal or bird from warning its fellows and so spoiling the hunt. This purpose is especially clear in cases where the eyes and tongue of the game are removed. Several examples of these hunter's customs are collected by Sir James Frazer in his *Golden Bough*<sup>3</sup>, VIII, 267 ff. The instance which comes nearest to the Greek custom is cited from the tribal customs of the Thompson Indians, of British Columbia.<sup>1</sup> There, when a man had been obliged, because of a certain kind of pollution, to give over hunting for a time, he was expected to take the following precaution upon resuming the chase:

He should cut off the head of the first grouse he snared, take out its eyes, and place two small roots . . . in its orbits, and another in its mouth. It was then hung above or near his pillow. If this were not done, he would not be able to snare any more grouse or other small game.

The feather in the nostrils of the Greek blackbird may be a less savage way of hoodwinking the bird and making it unable to interfere with the fowler's success.

It is well known that the barbarous custom of *μασχαλισμός*, which consisted in cutting off the extremities and stringing them about the neck of the victim, was prompted by the desire of the manslayer to escape the vengeance of his victim's ghost by depriving it of power to inflict an injury.<sup>2</sup> Thus the act with which the birds charge Philocrates the fowler is in its origin akin to the mutilation which Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra inflicted upon the body of Agamemnon, though Aristophanes would probably have been not a little surprised to hear it.

## II. THE BIRD CALLED Πάρδαλος

Among the migratory birds that are caught in Cythera, my informant, Mr. Perros, mentioned shrikes as especially common. They are known generically as *κεφαλᾶδες*, and several species have also distinguishing names. Mr. Perros' memory of the appearance of these birds was so precise that I thought it worth while to make notes of the names in connection with his descriptions; and, having an amateur's interest in ornithology, I tried to identify them. In Naumann's

<sup>1</sup> James Teit, "The Thompson Indians of British Columbia," *Memoirs of the American Museum of Natural History*, II, 317.

<sup>2</sup> Scholia on Soph. *Electra* 445, and various commentators on this passage and on Aesch. *Choeph.* 438. See also Frazer, *op. cit.*, VI, 188, and Kittredge, "Arm-pitting among the Greeks," *A.J.P.*, VI, 151-69.

*Naturgeschichte der Vögel Mitteleuropas* I found plates which corresponded strikingly to Mr. Perros' descriptions; and when he examined the pictures with me, he was able to point out the species that visit Cythera, and give to each the vernacular name by which he knew it. Thus the red-headed shrike, *Lanius senator*, is called κοκκινοκούκουλλος, or "redcap." *L. isabellinus* is κάνναβος, "hemp-bird," so called in Greek, as in scientific terminology, from its dirty, yellowish-brown color. *L. collurio*, the red-backed shrike, is called φεγγαριᾶτος—I cannot vouch for the spelling. Mr. Perros understood it to mean "moon-marked," and thought the name was derived from the approximately crescent-shaped patch of brownish red upon the back of the bird. Whether it has anything to do with the small, crescent-shaped speckles on the breast, which are mentioned by Naumann, I cannot say.

In Cythera the name of πάρδαλος, leopard, or pied is used to describe certain kinds of shrikes which differ in size and in various minute characteristics, but are alike in having an ashen-gray upper plumage, light under-parts, and prominent white markings on the wings, which have suggested the name. *Lanius excubitor*, *L. minor*, *L. meridionalis*, and perhaps *L. Homeyeri* are called πάρδαλοι without distinction.

This circumstance seems to throw light upon a doubtful passage in Aristotle *Hist. Anim.* ix. 23. 617b 6-9. There the writer describes briefly, and not overclearly, a bird called πάρδαλος, which even so eminent an authority as Professor D'Arcy W. Thompson is not able to identify. I think that Aristotle's description can be reconciled to the appearance of any one of the four species just named in the last paragraph. It is to be noted that he emphasizes the gregarious habits of the πάρδαλος; and at certain seasons shrikes are seen in Cythera in considerable numbers. On the other hand, while he describes the bird's plumage as ashen, he adds "entirely," taking no account of the prominent white wing-markings. It may be significant that the account of the πάρδαλος immediately follows that of the μαλακοκρανέως, or "soft-head," which Sundevall and Thompson agree in identifying as one of the shrikes.<sup>1</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

<sup>1</sup> See Thompson, *Glossary of Greek Birds*, pp. 112, 127.

## THUCYDIDEAN CHRONOLOGY ANTERIOR TO THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

BY ALLEN B. WEST

In relating events previous to the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides gives no exact dates. Instead, when he wishes to date an event precisely, he says that it took place in a given year before or after some landmark in Athenian history or that a stated number of years intervened between two such points of time. As the names of no eponymous archons occur, precise dating is by no means easy until we discover how Thucydides counted his years. There are several possible ways. He may have taken the calendar year as his unit, either including or excluding the *terminus a quo*—Beloch thinks that as a rule Thucydides used an inclusive reckoning of calendar or official years<sup>1</sup>—or Thucydides may have disregarded the calendar year entirely, adopting an artificial year, e.g., the military year which begins with spring and ends with the following winter. Busolt, arguing apparently from Thucydides' use of the military year as the unit of time in his annals of the Peloponnesian War, has attempted to prove that Thucydides reckoned by military years, always excluding the *terminus a quo*, in his record of events anterior to the war also.<sup>2</sup>

Busolt's assumption is on the face of it improbable, for it is evident that Thucydides did not consider summers and winters, i.e., seasons favorable or unfavorable to military activity, when dealing with affairs preceding the war, some of which have no concern with war or campaigns.<sup>3</sup> Since Busolt's system is strictly military, it would be pointless to use it for dating the exile of Hippias or for counting the years of his exile. Nor ought we to look for it in passages

<sup>1</sup> Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2, 178.

<sup>2</sup> Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 1, 198, n. 5; *ibid.*, 2, 800.

<sup>3</sup> We do not need Thucydides' words (ii. 1) to convince us that his use of military years begins with the spring of 431. His account of the period immediately preceding (i. 24-88, 118-28, 139-46) shows that he did not use the military year as the basis of his pre-war chronology. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2, 178, rejects Busolt's assumption in a most summary fashion.

where Thucydides pays no attention to summer and winter semesters. Consequently, Busolt's thesis that Thucydides consistently reckons by winters and summers when he dates events of the *Pentecontaetia* and before is clearly unwarranted.

It is my intention to prove, both from passages which Busolt cites and from others which he does not cite, that his method is chronologically impossible as well as improbable. In addition I shall show that Beloch's theory also is untenable in certain cases and that Thucydides disregarding both calendar and military years, counted his years in the following manner: Any given year of any given period begins with the anniversary of the event from which the period is dated and it ends with the corresponding day of the ensuing year.<sup>1</sup> Such a year I shall call *ἐνιαυτός*.<sup>2</sup> Take, for example, the murder of Hipparchos and the exile of Hippias. The first *ἐνιαυτός* begins with the day of the murder, Hec. 28, 514 B.C.,<sup>3</sup> and the fourth, in which Hippias was exiled,<sup>4</sup> falls between Hec. 28, 511, and Hec. 27, 510.

<sup>1</sup> I shall also test the three competing theories by applying them to the chronology of the years 466-450. This test Busolt apparently failed to make, for in one instance he does not reckon as his theory, so emphatically stated, necessitates; nor does he even suggest that he has found a problem to be solved by other means. Thus Busolt's own work proves that his system of reckoning cannot solve satisfactorily the chronological problems of the *Pentecontaetia*.

<sup>2</sup> I use the word *ἐνιαυτός* to mean a period of time exactly a calendar year in length, but not beginning with Hec. 1. I have chosen the word, somewhat arbitrarily perhaps, to differentiate this year from the military year of Busolt's theory and the calendar year of Beloch's, because Thucydides uses it at times when there can be no doubt as to his meaning, especially in his account of the Corinthian naval preparations after the battle of Leucimne. Thuc. i. 31; cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 2, 771 n. See also Thuc. i. 109. Thucydides often uses the word *ἔτος* with the meaning I have given to *ἐνιαυτός*, e.g., with reference to treaties. See Thuc. v. 18, for the treaty of 421 which was to remain in force 50 *ἔτη*. The *ἔτος* of the treaty is a year beginning with Elaph. 25. Since it is distinct both from the military and official years, I prefer to call it an *ἐνιαυτός*. Thuc. iv. 117; v. 1, uses the latter word in describing the truce of 423-422. Thus the two words are to a certain extent interchangeable, although in Thucydides *ἐνιαυτός* is never found in the plural, and in other prose authors rarely. For evident attempts to avoid the plural, see Thuc. iii. 87; vii. 28, where the two words for year are used side by side, the one in the singular, the other in the plural. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2, 178, has seen that the *ἔτος* of Thuc. i. 87, and ii. 2, was not a calendar year, but rather a year beginning on the anniversary of the day the Thirty Years' Truce was signed; in other words, our *ἐνιαυτός*. He is forced to this conclusion because his theory of an inclusive reckoning of official years meets an insuperable obstacle at this point. Since there are other cases where his theory does not work, it has seemed advisable to present evidence for still another hypothesis.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. vi. 54-58; Hdt. v. 56; cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 312.

<sup>4</sup> Thuc. vi. 59: *τυραννεύσας δὲ ἔτη τρία Ἰππίας ἐτι Ἀθηναίων καὶ παύσας ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ*.



In cases where Thucydides estimates periods of time in years and months, no one questions that the word *ἔτος* denotes *ἐνιαυτός*. For example, we are told that Pericles lived *δύο ἔτη καὶ ἑξ μῆνας* after the outbreak of the war,<sup>1</sup> and again that the Athenians and Spartans refrained from invading one another's territory for six years (*ἔτη*) and ten months.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the Athenians were besieged in Egypt an *ἐνιαυτός* and six months.<sup>3</sup> From these three passages we see that it makes little difference in dating whether we use one word or the other, for both are used to denote a year that begins with the event by which the period is dated, i.e., an *ἐνιαυτός*. No one has suggested any other alternative nor is it necessary to do so.

As it is clear that Thucydides reckons by *ἐνιαυτοί* when he wishes to date precisely the death of Pericles and to compute exactly the length of the peace between Athens and Sparta, we need not be surprised if he adopted the same system in estimating the length of intervals between events previous to the Peloponnesian War. Such a system of reckoning, however, is unusual, nor would it be found anywhere except in an author like Thucydides whose penchant was for accuracy of chronology and exact reckoning of periods of time. Thucydides' love for precision in these matters is well known, and I need only to refer to his careful estimates of the length of the Archidamian and Peloponnesian wars.<sup>4</sup>

A better example of Thucydides' careful use of numbers is to be found in the statement that the Revolution of the Four Hundred was carried out approximately in the hundredth year after the exile of the tyrants.<sup>5</sup> Now Hippias was exiled in the year 511-510 and the revolution came to a head in Thargelion 412-411.<sup>6</sup> Since reckoning

<sup>1</sup> Thuc., ii. 65.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, v. 25. This passage has been much discussed. Whether or not the solution of the difficulty rests upon emendation does not concern us here. The *ἔτη* are certainly not calendar years, and they are probably not military years. Thus they can only be what I have called *ἐνιαυτοί*. Cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 2, 1198, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 109.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, v. 20, 26.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, viii. 68.

<sup>6</sup> Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 32 is to be compared with Thucydides. Aristotle says that the revolution took place approximately one hundred years after the exile of the tyrants, *ἔτει δ' ὕστερον τῆς τῶν τυράννων ἐκβολῆς μάλιστα ἑκατόν*, not in the hundredth year as Thucydides says, *ἐπ' ἑτει ἑκατοστῷ μάλιστα*. As Aristotle includes the *terminus a quo* in his reckoning of calendar years, we find that he, too, uses the term *μάλιστα* correctly, for the revolution actually took place ninety-nine years after the exile of Hippias, or in the hundredth year.

by calendar years inclusively, as Beloch insists was done, makes 412-411 exactly the hundredth year after the exile of Hippias and deprives the word *μάλιστα* of all meaning, we must conclude that Thucydides reckoned otherwise. If we count the *ἐνιαυτοί* after the exile of Hippias, assuming that Hippias was exiled late in the year, i.e., after Tharg. 14, we see that the revolution occurred in the ninety-ninth year and that *μάλιστα* is correctly used.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, since the error cannot be more than a month and a half at the most, the *μάλιστα* indicates a desire for precision almost abnormal at the time. No clearer evidence of Thucydides' exactness of chronology could be desired. Such a striving for accuracy shows that he differed from his contemporaries.<sup>2</sup> Therefore we need not be surprised to find his chronology uniquely precise, based upon military years for the Peloponnesian War and upon *ἐνιαυτοί* for the period before the war.

It is easy to understand why Thucydides decided not to make use of the Athenian calendar and tables of archons for his chronology. No one could see better than he how unsatisfactory for general use would be a chronology based upon a local calendar, since the Hellenes, for whom his book was written, reckoned time in many different ways. Thucydides himself must have had difficulties in reconciling the dates he found in non-Athenian records with those preserved in his native city, and his twenty years of exile probably taught him the futility of using local calendars for the chronology of a work that was to be read throughout the breadth of the Greek world.

<sup>1</sup> Busolt, *op. cit.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 312 n., is able to explain the *μάλιστα* by means of his system of reckoning military years. Furthermore, an exclusive reckoning of calendar years would be satisfactory here, if it could not be shown that such reckoning is unsatisfactory in the majority of passages we have to consider.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. i. 97 criticizes Hellanicos for his inexact chronology. In this connection it is interesting to note that Thucydides almost never gives approximate numbers without indicating in some way, usually by a *μάλιστα*, that they are not quite correct. While *μάλιστα* in this sense occurs frequently in the pages of Thucydides, on four occasions only is it attached to chronological data—i. 13, 18, 118; viii. 68. Besides viii. 68, only one of these passages, i. 118, deals with events where exact chronology is possible. From it we learn that approximately fifty years intervened between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars. It is true that for the *Pentecontaetia* Thucydides frequently gives no chronological data except vaguely, e.g., *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα* or *οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον*, probably because his purpose was not that of an annalist; but whenever he states that an event happened a given number of years after the exile of Hippias and the like, his figures are found to be meticulously exact. None but a mathematician or a Thucydides would have given the exact number of years, ninety-two, between the alliance of Plataea with Athens and its capture in 427 (*ibid.*, iii. 68).

Thucydides' objections to a chronology based upon calendar years are clearly stated,<sup>1</sup> viz., that by such a system of dating "it is impossible to tell whether an event occurred in the beginning or in the middle or whatever might be the exact point of a magistrate's term of office." He would have us reckon the actual periods of time, *τοὺς χρόνους*,<sup>2</sup> not relying upon catalogues of archons or officials whose names might be used in different cities to mark the date of past events. While this was written with special reference to the length of the Archidamian War, it is clear that Thucydides must have felt it applicable to all reckonings of extended periods of time. We ought, therefore, to study the chronology of the century preceding the Peloponnesian War in the light of this chapter, reckoning *τοὺς χρόνους* and not *τὰ ἔτη*.

By this Thucydides meant that we should count the *ἐνιαυτοί*, for that is evidently the way he determined the exact length of the Archidamian and Peloponnesian wars. To the question why he used the word *χρόνους* instead of *ἐνιαυτούς* or the customary *ἔτη*, one may reply that the plural of *ἐνιαυτός* was not in his vocabulary and that it did not have the sole meaning given to it in this paper, so that both it and the word *ἔτη* would have made his meaning ambiguous.

Turning aside for a moment to Thucydides' criticism of the chronology of Hellanicos, we are perplexed to understand how Thucydides, whose chronology for the *Pentecontaetia* is by no means satisfactory, can have thought he was improving upon his predecessor. His words are as follows: *βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήσθη*.<sup>3</sup> The ordinary interpretation of this phrase, viz., that

<sup>1</sup> Thuc. v. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* v. 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* i. 97. One must remember that Thucydides and his contemporaries were not accustomed to numbering years from any one event, such as the first celebration of the Olympic games. This lack of a commonly recognized era made chronology difficult, as Thucydides understood; but by reckoning *κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους* and by arbitrarily choosing events from which to count, he was able to establish convenient eras of his own, such as those of the Thirty Years' Truce and the Peloponnesian War. Thus one might even turn the Greek phrase *κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους* into the English "by eras," keeping in mind that such an interpretation would necessarily mean reckoning by *ἐνιαυτοί*. When once the calendar year was rejected and arbitrary eras created, no standard year was possible, for one era might begin in spring and another in winter. It must be remembered, too, that Thucydides did not attempt to supply an adequate chronology for the period anterior to the war. His one purpose, ostensibly, was to tell how many years elapsed between important events or during extended operations such as the siege of Ithome or the campaign in Egypt, thereby correcting Hellanicos. Since

Hellanicos was inaccurate in his chronology, is unsatisfactory in proportion as the chronology of Thucydides is unsatisfactory. But if we should assume that the periods of time, χρόνοι, are ἐνιαυτοί, or a number of ἐνιαυτοί taken together, as in the two passages we have discussed, the meaning of the criticism and the nature of the corrections become clear, for reckoning by ἐνιαυτοί, or as Thucydides puts it, κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους, is more accurate than by tables of archons and ἔτη and at times brings totally different results.<sup>1</sup>

Whether Thucydides reckoned by ἐνιαυτοί might be questioned on the ground that in none of the passages to be discussed do we find any reference to months or any indication that Thucydides knew at what time of year an event occurred. But, on the other hand, in many instances the season of the year is immaterial to the narrative;<sup>2</sup> in others, it takes no great perspicacity to infer it.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, since Thucydides' account is so brief, the absence of such data is not surprising, even though so much emphasis is laid upon them in the body of the history. To take a concrete example, Thucydides tells us that Plataea was captured in the ninety-third year after its alliance with Athens.<sup>4</sup> As usual, he fails to state in what month this alliance was made, nor in this passing reference should we expect such exactness. We may be sure that this omission was not due to ignorance, for Thucydides' knowledge of the exact year shows that he had at his disposal records<sup>5</sup> to supplement the account of Herodotos, undoubt-

measurement of periods of time in terms of years was Thucydides' main object, reckoning by ἐνιαυτοί was most satisfactory, whereas it would have been unsatisfactory in an exhaustive chronological history of the period.

<sup>1</sup> Hellanicos in all probability reckoned by calendar years, and if he did attempt to estimate the length of time between events, he undoubtedly excluded the *terminus a quo*, for in most instances where Thucydides gives precise chronological indications, i.e., where he is presumably correcting Hellanicos, an inclusive reckoning is as accurate as one κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους.

<sup>2</sup> Except for verifying Thucydides' figures, we do not need to know in what month Hippias was exiled or when peace was made with Sparta in 446.

<sup>3</sup> The Persian expeditions must have commenced their march in the spring. Likewise, the Spartan invasion of Attica in 446 probably occurred in the summer about the time of the harvest, for it was customary to arrange the campaigns so that the citizen soldiers might be home by the middle of the summer.

<sup>4</sup> Thuc. iii. 68.

<sup>5</sup> These records may be from the same source as those that enabled him to correct Herodotos in other points of Peisistratid history. That the alliance was made in the time of the tyrants seems to me incontrovertible.

edly familiar to him.<sup>1</sup> From Herodotos we know that the Plataeans appealed to Athens when the sacrifice to the Twelve Gods was being offered. Though the date of such a festival is unknown to us, we need not assume it unknown to Thucydides, for he tells us of the dedication of an altar to these gods by the younger Peisistratos.<sup>2</sup> Thus in a case where we should least expect precise knowledge on the part of Thucydides, we find that he probably had such knowledge but thought it unnecessary to impart.

We must begin our study of the chronology of the *Pentecontaetia* by discussing passages<sup>3</sup> dealing with the Thirty Years' Truce and the invasion of Attica by Pleistoanax. The invasion, according to Thucydides, occurred fourteen years before the Peloponnesian War,<sup>4</sup> while in the fourteenth year of the Thirty Years' Truce which followed the invasion, the Lacedaemonians at the time of the first meeting at Sparta in 432 decided to make war on Athens.<sup>5</sup> The truce was in force fourteen complete years before the attack on Plataea was made.<sup>6</sup>

Thucydides narrates the events leading up to the Thirty Years' Truce in the following order.<sup>7</sup> Not long after the battle of Coronea and the loss of Boeotia, Euboea revolted from Athens and Pericles was sent to the island only to be recalled by the revolt of Megara. Thereupon the Peloponnesian army under Pleistoanax invaded Attica, ravaged some portion of the country, and returned home. The Athenians then crossed over to Euboea again and conquered the rebellious cities. Soon after their return from the island, they made a truce for thirty years with Sparta.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. vi. 108.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. vi. 54.

<sup>3</sup> Certain passages cited by Busolt in support of his theory prove little or nothing. In the first one (Thuc. vi. 59; cf. Hdt. v. 56; Busolt, *op. cit.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 312. Hippias ruled three years after the murder of Hipparchos and was exiled in the fourth), any one of three methods of calculation, Busolt's, Beloch's, or ours, brings correct results. Busolt's second passage (Thuc. vi. 59. After his exile Hippias went first to Sigeion, then to Lampsacos, *ἐκείθεν* to the king, whence he set out on the expedition to Marathon in the twentieth year) requires us to exclude from the possibilities an inclusive reckoning of calendar years, but by Busolt's method or our own we can date the exile of Hippias in the spring of 510, shortly before the end of the calendar year when it probably occurred. For this date see p. 217, *supra*. A third passage (Thuc. i. 18. In the tenth year after the battle of Marathon Xerxes led his expedition into Greece) cannot be used to bolster any particular theory, for any one of four methods of reckoning is equally satisfactory.

<sup>4</sup> Thuc. ii. 21.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* i. 87.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* i. 114.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Diod. xii. 7; Paus. v. 23. 4.

Diodoros has given precise dates for these events, even though he does not narrate them in the proper chronological sequence. Still he is more than usually valuable to us, for by comparing him with Thucydides, all the necessary corrections can be easily made. Diodoros' dates for the battle of Coronea, 447-446, the invasion of Attica, 447-446, the subjugation of Euboea, 446-445, and the conclusion of peace with Sparta, 446-445,<sup>1</sup> may be accepted without question. He errs in placing the Peloponnesian invasion before the Boeotian revolt—an error easily corrected by rearranging events within the same year—and in placing the revolt of Euboea in the same year as its reduction. Since the revolt of Euboea and the first attempt of the Athenians to reconquer it preceded the Peloponnesian invasion, in this case he has probably used the date of the subjugation of the island to cover the whole series of events leading up to it—a mistake common enough in his pages. But these mistakes are not sufficient to invalidate Diodoros' date for the invasion of Pleistoanax, nor is there anything in Thucydides, nor in any of our other ancient authorities, to raise doubts as to its accuracy. Thus the invasion probably took place in the early summer of 446.<sup>2</sup> As these invasions were for the most part raids on a large scale with the destruction of the enemy's crops as their primary object, early summer was the time best suited for an invasion and quite in keeping with the Spartan custom.

Unless we reckon by *ἐνιαυτοί*, this date will not accord with Thucydides' statement that the invasion of Pleistoanax occurred fourteen years before the Peloponnesian War, for if Thucydides began to count with the calendar year 432-431, as Beloch believes, then the fifteenth year was 446-445, one year later than the date given by Diodoros, a date that Beloch thinks not even worthy of refutation.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, if Thucydides' first year extends from the attack on Plataea, i.e., Gam. 29, 431, to Gam. 29, 432, the fifteenth year

<sup>1</sup> Diod. xii. 6-7.

<sup>2</sup> Such a date for the invasion necessitates our placing the first expedition of Pericles and the revolt of Euboea in the spring of 446, although Diodoros puts the revolt in the year in which the island was finally conquered. As several Euboean cities paid their tribute in the spring of 446 (*IG*. I. 233), it is impossible to date the revolt before Elaphebolion. Cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 422.

<sup>3</sup> Busolt, *ibid.*, n. 1, dates the invasion in the summer of 446 correctly without trying to determine the calendar year in which it fell.



extends from Gam. 29, 445, to Gam. 29, 446, and the invasion must have taken place in the summer of 446.<sup>1</sup>

The date of the truce, 446-445, can be more precisely determined. As it was made probably before the spring of 445,<sup>2</sup> Busolt's system of reckoning military years is possible in this instance; yet the language of Thucydides proves its incorrectness. Nowhere does Thucydides so definitely tell us how he reckoned time before the Peloponnesian War as in the two passages that refer to the Thirty Years' Truce,<sup>3</sup> and these passages are the clearest evidence we have that he reckoned by *ἐνιαυτοί*. His first statement that the council at Sparta was held *ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει τριακοντὸντῶν σπονδῶν προκεχωρηκυῖαν*, compared with the second, *τέσσαρα μὲν γὰρ καὶ δέκα ἔτη ἐνέμειναν αἱ τριακοντούτεες σπονδαί . . . τῷ δὲ πέμπτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει*, shows that he counted from the making of the truce, disregarding calendar years<sup>4</sup> and adopting as his unit the *ἐνιαυτός*, commencing on the day when the treaty was finally ratified. Thus, if we assume that the first year of Thucydides' reckoning begins with the date of the Thirty Years' Truce, by counting backward from Gam. 29, the date of the attack on Plataea,<sup>5</sup> we see that the truce must have been made before Gam. 29, 445. Furthermore, as the fifteenth year of the truce began in the interval between the first council at Sparta, summer or early autumn, 432,<sup>6</sup> and the attack on Plataea, the date for its ratification must fall in the second half of the summer or in the winter of 446-445.

That the truce was made in the summer of 446 can be clearly seen from a study of the Samian revolt. Modern historians, following Diodoros,<sup>7</sup> date the beginning of the Samian troubles in the year 441-440. The question for us to answer is in what season Athens first intervened in Samian affairs. Thucydides dates this intervention in

<sup>1</sup> If preferred, Anth. 30 may be substituted in the text for Gam. 29. But see West, *Class. Phil.*, X, 34-53; Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 2, 907, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2, 178, admits here that his system of reckoning is impossible and that Thucydides counted *ἐνιαυτοί*, not calendar years.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 87; ii. 2; cf. v. 20, 26.

<sup>4</sup> Aside from the language of Thucydides which makes it clear that he was reckoning by *ἐνιαυτοί*, a simple calculation shows that he did not reckon by calendar years.

<sup>5</sup> This took place in the fifteenth year of the truce (Thuc. ii. 2).

<sup>6</sup> The council was held in the ephorship of Sthenelaidas, i.e., before October 20. Thuc. i. 87; Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 2, 803, n., 832, n. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Diod. xii. 27.



the sixth year of the truce with Sparta.<sup>1</sup> A careful study of the sources for this affair<sup>2</sup> shows that it occupied parts of two calendar years, that four fleets were despatched from Athens, and that the siege of Samos after lasting nine months ended in the autumn of 440. We must then date the revolt of Samos and the second expedition of Pericles in March or April, 440.<sup>3</sup> The Samian quarrel with Miletos and the first expedition of Pericles must now be dated in the autumn of the preceding year, for it is not at all probable that the Athenians would care to send a fleet to Samos in the middle of winter. Moreover, as we see from Thucydides,<sup>4</sup> there was an interval of some length between the establishment of the democracy by Pericles and the final revolt. In any case, we cannot possibly assign the first expedition to the spring of 440.<sup>5</sup>

We are now in a position to prove that Busolt's system of reckoning is incorrect. Assuming with him that the truce was made with Sparta before the spring of 445, and using an exclusive reckoning of military years, we find that the sixth year begins with March or April, 440; but we have already seen that Samos was then in open revolt and that Pericles had already made one expedition to Samos in the preceding year.<sup>6</sup> Thus Busolt's thesis lacks substantiation in this particular instance, and we see that the only possible solution of the problem in accord with the facts of this and the other passages we are studying is that Thucydides counted his years from the event by which he

<sup>1</sup> Thuc. i. 115. Beloch's system is satisfactory here.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 115-17; Diod. xii, 27 f.; Plutarch *Pericles*, 24-28; cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 545, n. 4; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>3</sup>, 2, 215 f.

<sup>3</sup> I need not emphasize the fact that winter or early spring was the time best suited for a revolt from Athens. There was much to be done while the weather prevented rapid communication with Athens and active measures hostile to the plans of the rebels, particularly the rescue of the hostages in Lemnos and the capture of the Athenian garrison. The Samian preparations for an attack on Miletos also point to a revolt in early spring (Thuc. i. 115; cf. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>3</sup>, 2, 215).

<sup>4</sup> Thuc. i. 115.

<sup>5</sup> That the revolt occurred in 441-440 is also shown by *IG. I. 177*. Cf. Meyer, *G.d.A.*, IV, 65.

<sup>6</sup> Busolt's system of reckoning has forced him to date as follows: 440, March-April, war between Samos and Miletos; May, intervention of Athens; early July, revolt and departure of Pericles with fleet (*op. cit.*, III, 1, 545, n. 4). For this crowding of events between March and July there is no evidence in ancient sources, and Busolt is almost alone among modern historians in assigning the first expedition of Pericles to the spring of 440. Cf. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>3</sup>, 2, 215.

dated a second event. In this instance his first year began at the time when peace was made with Sparta in 446.

It is now possible to date the peace with Sparta in the summer of 446 soon after the beginning of Olymp. 83, 3.<sup>1</sup> If we place it too late in the summer, there will be no time for Pericles to make his first expedition to Samos before winter weather prevents maritime operations. Perhaps the most satisfactory date would be August or September.

We must now try to discover when Pleistoanax was forced into exile by public indignation at his precipitate retreat from Attica.<sup>2</sup> Exactly when this occurred is not stated by any ancient authority, but we may take it for granted that he was exiled not long after the failure of his expedition and that the reaction against him did not come to a head so long as his party was in power. We may therefore conclude that the frustration of the Spartan plan to destroy the Athenian Empire brought on a decided change in public opinion and aroused general dissatisfaction with the policies of the government. When the Spartan authorities instead of continuing the war made peace with Athens, new ephors, hostile to Pleistoanax, were elected by the anti-Athenian party. As soon as they came into office in the autumn of 446, they took measures to punish the men responsible for the defeat of the Lacedaemonian plans. It was too late for them to alter the conditions of peace, but they could indict Pleistoanax on the charge of having received bribes from Pericles and so vent their displeasure.<sup>3</sup> That the peace was made before the exile and under the old ephors, i.e., before the fall elections of 446,<sup>4</sup> hardly needs proof. In this we have additional evidence for dating the peace in the summer of that year.

<sup>1</sup> Paus. v. 23. 4; Diod. xii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. ii. 21; Plutarch *Pericles*, 22.

<sup>3</sup> A similar change of public opinion in 421 resulted in the election of anti-Athenian ephors when a truce and alliance had just been made between the two states (Thuc. v. 36).

<sup>4</sup> I cannot agree with Beloch (*Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1, 184) that the exile was the result of the election of hostile ephors in 445. It seems hardly probable that public opinion should have remained at such a high pitch for almost a year and a half, especially in view of the fact that in the interval, in the winter of 446-445 as Beloch thinks, Sparta virtually indorsed the retreat from Attica by making peace. It seems better to assign the peace to the summer of 446 and the exile to the following autumn.

Our date for the exile of Pleistoanax, autumn or early winter of 446-445, must be compared with Thucydides' statements that in the nineteenth year after his departure he returned to Sparta<sup>1</sup> and that his brother Cleomenes, who was the guardian of Pleistoanax's young son, was in command of the expedition of 427.<sup>2</sup> We see from this that Pleistoanax did not return from banishment before the summer of 427. The nineteenth *ἐνιαυτός* of his exile ends during the winter of 427-426, whereas the nineteenth calendar year, reckoned inclusively, ends in the autumn of 427.<sup>3</sup> We may therefore assume that Pleistoanax was recalled in the autumn or early winter of 427.

Other evidence tends to confirm this assumption. In the first place, it strikes us as surprising that the invasion of Attica in the spring of 426 was intrusted not to Cleomenes, the successful general of 427, but to Agis.<sup>4</sup> Since Pleistoanax would not have been chosen for such a command, even though public opinion had sanctioned his recall, Agis was the man to undertake the task,<sup>5</sup> and to Agis was given the command again in 425 when Pleistoanax was certainly in Sparta. Thus the preference of Agis to Cleomenes in 426 is to be explained by the recall of Pleistoanax which deprived Cleomenes of his position of authority.

To Pleistoanax were attributed all the Spartan misfortunes since his recall.<sup>6</sup> In 427 the Spartan series of failures began with the expeditions to Mytilene and Corcyra.<sup>7</sup> In 426 earthquakes prevented an invasion of Attica; the colony of Heraclea was destined to failure from the start; and the expedition of Eurylochos ended in a disgraceful fiasco.<sup>8</sup> Then came the affair at Pylos and Sphacteria. Again we must assign the recall to 427 if we are to connect it with the first of this long line of Spartan misadventures.

The policy of Pleistoanax after his recall was in favor of peace.<sup>9</sup> No individual in Sparta would have gained so much by it as he. Thus,

<sup>1</sup> Thuc. v. 16.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 26.

<sup>3</sup> If Thucydides reckoned by calendar years here, it is probable that he used the Spartan calendar, since the exile was purely a local matter and Thucydides must have received his information from Spartan sources. Thus the nineteenth year ends in the autumn. This passage furnishes a good example of the confusion likely to arise from a use of calendar years in reckoning.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, iii. 89.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 89; iv. 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* v. 16.

<sup>7</sup> Practically the sole exception was the capture of Plataea.

<sup>8</sup> Thuc. iii. 31-33, 69-80, 89, 92 f., 100-109.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* v. 14-17.

when we hear of a Lacedaemonian attempt to come to terms with Athens in 427 or 426, we immediately see the hand of Pleistoanax at work<sup>1</sup> and conclude that his Delphian intrigue had restored him to the throne. In this connection Sparta's care not to take Plataea by assault in 427 is especially interesting. Sparta was then looking toward a compromise peace that would leave Plataea in her hands.<sup>2</sup>

Since every indication points to the return of the exiled king in 427, our method of reckoning and our dates for his exile, autumn or winter of 446-445, and for the peace, August-September, 446, are confirmed. The fourteenth year now ends in August-September, 432, and the council at Sparta held in that year must have convened before the end of summer, probably in August soon after the passage of the Megarean decree.<sup>3</sup>

Busolt has cited one more statement from Thucydides which, rightly understood, proves again the incorrectness of his theory,<sup>4</sup> viz., that the Athenians tried unsuccessfully to found a colony on the Strymon thirty-two years after Aristagoras' death at Ennea Hodoi, and finally succeeded with the settlement of Amphipolis in the twenty-ninth year after their failure. The dates as we know them from other sources are as follows: Athenian failure, 465-464; settlement of Amphipolis, 437-436.<sup>5</sup> To reconcile his system of calculation with the figures given by Thucydides, Busolt has assumed that Aristagoras died in the winter of 498-497, and that the Athenians failed in the summer of 465.<sup>6</sup> The first date, plainly an assumption on the part of Busolt, is based upon a theory that he cannot prove.

<sup>1</sup> Aristophanes *Acharnians* 652 f.; Beloch, *Att. Pol.*, p. 24; Meyer, *op. cit.*, IV, 378; Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 2, 1079, n. 5. Busolt dates this in 426-425 after the expedition of Eurylochos.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. iii. 52. Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 2, 1035, n. 4, connects the change in the Spartan plan of campaign at Plataea with the loss of hope that the Athenian Empire would be destroyed. The Lesbian failure he thinks responsible for the growing desire for peace. He should have gone farther and connected Spartan pacifism with Pleistoanax's recall, either as its cause or its result. Busolt's date for the recall, summer of 426 or the following winter, is therefore too late. Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 2, 1078. Because of his theory he was forced to postdate Pleistoanax's return to Sparta.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 67.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 102; cf. Diod. xii. 68.

<sup>5</sup> Schol. *Aeschines* ii. 31; Diod. xii. 32. Diod. xi. 70 dates the first attempt in 464-346, which, for several reasons, is too late. For further discussion see Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 198, n. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Busolt, *ibid.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 537, n. 3; 548, n. 7; III, 1, 560 f.

It is unnecessary here to discuss the chronology of the Ionian revolt, for a study of Herodotos and his commentators will readily show that Aristagoras was killed not before the summer of 497 and probably in the winter of 497-496.<sup>1</sup> We now have a second instance in which Busolt's system of reckoning is inapplicable; for the first Athenian attempt to found a colony at Ennea Hodoi, if we follow Busolt, must be dated in the military year 464-463, and the founding of Amphipolis in the twenty-ninth year afterward, between the spring of 435 and the end of the following winter. These dates are too late. By our method we can assign the first Athenian attempt to the Attic year 465-464, and the settlement of the new city to the year 437-436, and it makes little difference whether the failure occurred in the summer of 465 or in the spring of 464.<sup>2</sup>

We have now to consider the period between the revolt of Thasos and the Five Years' Truce. For the chronology of this period we are dependent upon Thucydides, supplemented by other sources such as the annals of Diodoros. Though the chronological indications given by Thucydides are few and difficult to use, yet the accuracy of his account, especially as to the order of events, is unquestionable, since his purpose, in part at least, was to correct the chronology of Hellenicos.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, in our attempts to date events between 466 and 450 precisely, we must follow the order of events found in Thucydides, interpreting his chronological indications as best we may.

We must first determine the date of the Five Years' Truce. Since there is no evidence of the infraction of this truce, we must conclude that it expired before the invasion of Attica by Pleistoanax in the summer of 446 (447-446), shortly after the revolt of Euboea. Thus the truce must have been made in the spring of 451.<sup>4</sup>

Although most modern writers, except Beloch, have assumed that the peace was broken by the Spartan invasion, this is a pure assump-

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. v. 124-26. For chronology of this period see Macan, *Herodotos Books iv-vi*, II, 62, 70; Stein, *Herodotos*, V, 33 n.; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2, 58 ff.; Busolt, *ibid.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 537, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Beloch, *ibid.*, 2, 193 f.; Meyer, *op. cit.*, III, 534 f.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 97; cf. pp. 219-20 *supra*.

<sup>4</sup> On this point we can agree with Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2, 202, who both emphasizes the fact that the peace was not broken and dates it a little before midsummer, 451, or perhaps at the beginning of 451-450.

tion based upon an incorrect chronology. Not a shred of evidence is back of it, as will appear from a brief survey of the events preceding the renewal of hostilities. After the death of Cimon broke the last bond of sympathy between Athens and Sparta, nothing happened until the so-called Sacred War served to arouse the latent antagonism anew. Thereupon the Boeotian exiles, undoubtedly with moral support from the Peloponnesos, contrived to seize Orchomenos and Chaeronea, bringing on the battle of Coronea and the complete separation of Boeotia from the Athenian alliance. During the remainder of that winter (447-446) no act of war was committed by the Spartans, apparently because they had no intention of attacking Athens until the end of the truce.

But they were not idle. They plotted with several of Athens' subject allies for concerted action in the spring. Athens was to be surprised at three points in rapid succession. Euboea was to begin the program; then when the attention of Athens was engaged, the Megarid was to be seized by a force of Corinthians and Sicyonians; finally the Peloponnesian troops were to invade Attica under Pleistoanax. These events were evidently timed to take place about the end of the five-year period. The payment of tribute by the cities of Euboea as usual in the spring of 446<sup>1</sup> shows the craft with which the Spartans lulled the suspicions of Athens and makes it clear, first, that there was a general plan of campaign which included more than the Euboeans, and secondly, that the other participants in the plot were not ready when the tribute was due. The whole plot can now be made out. The revolt of Euboea was to take place about the time the truce expired; then the seizure of the Megarid was to open the way for an invasion of Attica to take place when Sparta was no longer restrained by its treaty with Athens.

Thus, taking everything into consideration, we may conclude that the silence of our authorities with regard to this hypothetical breach of peace by Sparta is due to the fact that the truce was not broken but had expired before the invasion of Attica. It was made, therefore, in the spring or summer of 451.

There is one more piece of definite evidence in favor of our date for the Five Years' Truce—the fact that Cimon conducted the negotia-

<sup>1</sup> *IG.*, I, 233.

tions. Tradition has it that Cimon was recalled from ostracism for this express purpose.<sup>1</sup> If tradition is correct, since his ten years expired not later than the spring of 451, the peace must be dated not later than the end of that calendar year. But it is unnecessary to discuss that question here, for Beloch, who refuses to accept the tradition, has given other convincing arguments to show that the summer of 451 is the only possible date for the truce.<sup>2</sup>

In the three years preceding the truce Athens accomplished nothing of importance.<sup>3</sup> Thucydides' statement is perfectly clear, *διαλιπόντων ἐτῶν τριῶν*. It is possible that we have a reference to military years in this passage, but in view of our previous discussion this is doubtful. No system of reckoning allows us to date the expedition against Oeniadae which preceded these three empty years later than the autumn of 455 or very early in the spring of 454. It is interesting to note that Diodoros in one of his two accounts of the expedition against Oeniadae dates it in the year 455-454.<sup>4</sup>

This expedition followed shortly after an attempt to restore the Thessalian prince, Orestes.<sup>5</sup> We are therefore justified in assuming that this Thessalian adventure occurred earlier in the summer of 455.<sup>6</sup> Since Thucydides tells of the Egyptian catastrophe before speaking of the failure in Thessaly,<sup>7</sup> the latter was either just after, or coincident with, the destruction of the fleet in Egypt. Thucydides has inserted no phrase such as *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα* to indicate that there was an appreciable interval between them. Thus we may date the two events in the spring of 455, perhaps as late as June of that year.<sup>8</sup> Another reason for thinking that the Egyptian misfortune came in the early part of the campaigning season is that reinforcements arrived just

<sup>1</sup> Diod. xi. 86; Plutarch *Cimon* 18; *Pericles* 10; Andoc. iii. 3; Theop. frg. 92. Cf. Meyer, *op. cit.*, III, 569, 594 ff., 612; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>3</sup>, 2, 209.

<sup>2</sup> Beloch, *ibid.*, p. 209.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 111-12.

<sup>4</sup> Diod. xi. 86. That it cannot have occurred earlier than the summer of 455 we shall see later.

<sup>5</sup> Thuc. i. 111.

<sup>6</sup> Diod. xi. 83 dates it incorrectly in 457-456. Attempts to date it in 454-453 because of references to a treaty with the Phocians in a mutilated inscription (*IG.*, I., Supp. 22b) are answered by Beloch (*Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>3</sup>, 2, 202).

<sup>7</sup> Thuc. i. 110.

<sup>8</sup> For the June date, see Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 328.



after the main body had been destroyed. These were probably the troops ordinarily sent in the spring of each year to fill the places of the men killed during the previous year and to prepare for the coming one. Thus indications point to a date in the spring or early summer of 455 for the affair in Egypt.

Modern historians have usually connected the Egyptian catastrophe with the removal of the Delian treasury to Athens. In this they have followed Plutarch, who says that the Athenians excused themselves for so doing by saying that the barbarians might seize it if it were left in Delos.<sup>1</sup> As the treasury was in Athens in 454-453, there was just about time for the transfer to be made between the spring of 455, when Athenian naval supremacy was threatened by the losses in Egypt, and the Dionysiac festival of 454-453, when we know that the treasury was in Athens.<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, in the account of Thucydides, the expedition of Tolmides immediately precedes the unfortunate Egyptian campaign, nor is there any expression to indicate a long interval, if any, between the two events.<sup>3</sup> That this expedition took place in 456-455 is generally accepted and well established.<sup>4</sup> This agrees with our previous conclusion that the defeat in Egypt occurred in the spring of 455.<sup>5</sup>

We have now to determine the date of the intervention in Egypt. As the Athenian forces were captured after fighting six years, *ἕξ ἔτη πολεμήσαντα*,<sup>6</sup> we must assign the destruction of the Athenian army to the seventh year after the intervention. If we count military years with Busolt, we must date the intervention in the military year 462-461, which is too early, as we shall see later.<sup>7</sup> But if we count calendar

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch *Pericles* 12; cf. *Aristides* 25.

<sup>2</sup> Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 204, in trying to defend the date 456 for the Egyptian defeat, says that in such an important matter as the removal of the treasury considerable time [two years] was required. One year would seem to be ample.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 108.

<sup>4</sup> Diod. xi. 84; Schol. Aeschines ii. 75.

<sup>5</sup> The expedition of Tolmides is also used by Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 204, to defend the year 456. His argument, that if the eighteen months' siege in Egypt had begun in 457, Tolmides would not have been sent about the Peloponnesos but to Egypt with reinforcements, is not at all convincing.

<sup>6</sup> Thuc. i. 110. This is apparently the equivalent of *ἔτει ἑβδόμῳ*, for in another place (vi. 59) Thucydides tells us that Hippias, after ruling three years, was exiled in the fourth, *τυραννεύσας δὲ ἔτη τετρά 'Ἰππίας ἐν Ἀθηναίων καὶ παυθεὶς ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ*.

<sup>7</sup> Notwithstanding Busolt's positive statements about the necessity of an exclusive reckoning of military years, in this case without a word of explanation he adopts another system. The dates he gives are 459 and 454. Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 304; cf. 328.

years with Beloch, we must assign it to the calendar year 462-461, or if we reckon by *ἐνιαυτοί*, assuming that the seventh year began shortly before the end of the struggle in Egypt, we must date the intervention in the spring of 461.<sup>1</sup> As Busolt's system is quite out of the question here,<sup>2</sup> unless it can be shown that the intervention took place earlier than the spring of 461, we have no means of deciding whether Thucydides reckoned by calendar years or by *ἐνιαυτοί*.<sup>3</sup>

Other ancient authorities are found to be in entire agreement with our solution of the problem. Busolt has shown that Diodoros' account of the first stages of the revolt is dated correctly,<sup>4</sup> for he is in essential agreement with our only other detailed authority Ktesias.<sup>5</sup> Diodoros' date for the beginning of the revolt in Egypt, 463-462, agrees with our Thucydidean account in two points. In the first place, Athens did not intervene until after Inaros had made himself master of the country, which, as Busolt shows, must have taken time; in the second place, from our study of Thucydidean chronology we have seen that Athens intervened in the spring of 461 or thereabouts, which leaves a sufficient interval for Inaros to win over the greater part of Egypt before Athens decided to give him her support. Diodoros gives us a second date that stands the test of comparison with Thucydides when he assigns the first appearance of Athenian troops in Egypt to the year 462-461.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>3</sup>, 205, thinks the intervention took place in the spring of 461.

<sup>2</sup> See n. 2, p. 236, *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Some modern historians have connected Thucydides' account of the intervention in Egypt, the battles of Halieis and Ceeryphaleia, the war with Aegina, and the campaign of Myronides in Megara (Thuc. iv. 104-6) with the inscription (*IG.*, I, 433), that records the names of the members of the tribe Erechtheis who fell in Phoenicia, Cyprus, Egypt, Halieis, Aegina, and the Megarid in some one year. Unfortunately, the inscription is undated, but it is not at all important to the question at issue until we know that the campaigns of the inscription are those of the first year after Athenian intervention in Egypt. It is quite possible to assign the campaigns to a later year if we assume that the fighting in Cyprus went on for a time after Athens sent aid to Inaros.

<sup>4</sup> Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 304 n.

<sup>5</sup> Diod. xi. 71; Ktes. *Ecl.* 32 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Diod. xi. 74. He is wrong in stating that the Athenians took part in the defeat of Achaimenes, but his date is apparently correct. Cf. Thuc. i. 104. Beloch gives other convincing arguments for dating the Athenian intervention in Egypt in 462-461 (*Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>3</sup>, 2, 205). Whether Diodoros' dates for Halieis, Ceeryphaleia, the war against Aegina (459-458), and the campaign of Myronides in Megara (458-457) are correct is immaterial to our discussion so long as we do not know the date of the sepulchral inscription (Diod. xi. 78-79).

But, as Busolt says, the year of the intervention is determined by the date of the capture of Ithome which took place in the fourth year after the Helot revolt,<sup>1</sup> for there is nothing in Thucydides<sup>2</sup> to indicate a long interval, if any, between the end of the Messenian resistance in Ithome and the Egyptian expedition. Thus, arguing from the fact that Athens probably intervened in Egypt in the spring of 461, we may assume that Ithome fell in the same spring. That this is correct will appear when we see that the spring of 461 is probably the beginning of the fourth year after the revolt.

When the Helots revolted, the Lacedaemonians were preparing to aid the Thasians by invading Attica in accordance with a promise made to the rebels.<sup>3</sup> Now Thasos rebelled in 466–465, and it is natural to suppose that the Spartan plans contemplated an invasion of Attica at the earliest possible moment after the situation at Thasos became acute. There would have been little point in delaying if they really intended to aid Thasos. We can then date the Helot revolt in the spring of 464.<sup>4</sup> The fourth calendar year, reckoned inclusively, is therefore 462–461, while the fourth *ἐνιαυτός* began in the spring of 461. Thus the intervention in Egypt follows closely upon the capture of Ithome, as the account of Thucydides leads us to suppose.<sup>5</sup>

We come now to the revolt of Thasos. It is generally agreed that it occurred in 466–465, either late summer, 466, or early summer, 465.<sup>6</sup> We can therefore date the subjugation of the island, which happened in the third year of the siege, either in the calendar year

<sup>1</sup> Thuc. i. 103. The sequence of events as well as general probability requires us to change the *δεκάριον* of the MSS to *τεράριον*. See Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 298, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. i. 103.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 101.

<sup>4</sup> This agrees with the date given by Plutarch *Cimon* 16, the fourth year of the reign of Archidamos, and that given by Pausanias (iv. 24. 5; *Olymp.* 79. 1). The fourth year of Archidamos' rule was probably 465–464 (Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 198, n. 5), while *Olymp.* 79. 1 in the time of Pausanias was considered the equivalent of the Julian year 464 (Meyer, *op. cit.*, III, 534. Cf. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2, 194 f.).

<sup>5</sup> Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 298, n. 2, because of his theory about military years, assigns the capture of Ithome to the winter of 460–459. Thus he can connect it with an inscription (*IG.*, I, Supp. p. 9, 22*g*), very fragmentary, which is of very uncertain date, perhaps 459–458, and which possibly refers to the settlement of the Messenians from Ithome in Naupactos. The contents of the inscription, however, are unknown, and we must be careful not to use it as a means of dating the capture of Ithome.

<sup>6</sup> Thuc. i. 100; iv. 102; Schol. *Aesch.* ii. 31; Plutarch *Cimon* 14; cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, I, 198, n. 5.

464-463 or in an *ἐνιαυτός* beginning with the second half of 464 or the first half of 463. As Diodoros assigns it to the year 464-463,<sup>1</sup> we cannot be very far wrong if we date it in the early summer of 463, and this fits in well with Cimon's career during this period.<sup>2</sup>

The outline chronology is now complete. Thasos revolted in 466-465. During the siege, *ὑπὸ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους*, the Athenian attempt to found a colony on the Strymon failed.<sup>3</sup> In the spring of 464 when the Lacedaemonians were preparing to aid Thasos by invading Attica, the Helots revolted. In the spring of 463, *τρίτῳ ἔτει* of the siege, Thasos was conquered.<sup>4</sup> Then in the fourth year of the Helot revolt, *τετάρτῳ ἔτει*, in the spring of 461, Ithome was captured. Following close upon this, or coincident with it, came the alliance with Megara<sup>5</sup> and the intervention in Egypt.<sup>6</sup> In 456 Tolmides made his famous voyage about the Peloponnesos,<sup>7</sup> and then shortly afterward, *ἔξ ἔτη πολεμήσαντα*, came the Egyptian catastrophe in the spring or early summer of 455.<sup>8</sup> This preceded shortly, or coincided with, the Athenian expedition to Thessaly. In the autumn of the same year, *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα οὐ πολλῶ ὕστερον*, Pericles attacked Oeniadae.<sup>9</sup> After three years of inaction, *διαλιπόντων ἐτῶν τριῶν*,<sup>10</sup> in the early summer of 451, a truce for five years was made with Sparta. The truce expired in the spring of 446, whereupon the Peloponnesian army invaded Attica.

That no satisfactory chronology can be obtained by a reckoning of military years that excludes the *terminus a quo* can be seen from

<sup>1</sup> Diod. xi. 70.

<sup>2</sup> Study of Cimon's career shows that no satisfactory chronology is possible unless we assign the revolt of Thasos to the calendar year 466-465. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II, 2, 194, cites *IG.*, I, 432, and Plutarch *Cimon* 13, to show that the revolt took place in the first half of the calendar year. It is unnecessary to decide the point here. Cimon, after subduing Thasos, instead of attacking Alexander of Macedon, returned to Athens, was accused by the young Pericles of having taken bribes, brought to trial on this charge, and acquitted (Plutarch *Cimon* 14; *Pericles*, 10). This trial, if we may believe Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 27), who dates it incorrectly, was the ordinary *euthynai*, held each year at the close of a term in office. As this investigation took place before Cimon's Peloponnesian expedition of 462, it must be dated in the summer of 463. Thus there can be no question that Thasos was conquered in the spring of 463.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 100.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 108.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 101.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* 109 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 103.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* 111.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 104.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* 112.

the following outline: The Helots rebelled in the spring of 464 and Ithome was captured in the military year 460-459, as Busolt states, toward the end of winter.<sup>1</sup> The Egyptian intervention would now fall in the spring or summer of 459 and the destruction of the fleet in 453 or 452.<sup>2</sup> Granting that Busolt's system of reckoning permits our assigning the defeat to 454, which it does not, and dating the expedition to Thessaly and the one against Oeniadae in the same summer (454), we cannot date the Five Years' Truce before 450, for the third military year would close with the end of winter, 451-450. This is one year too late, for if the peace had been made then, it would have been broken by Pleistoanax in 446. Aside from the question whether the truce was broken or not, we have seen that Busolt's chronology is inconsistent with the theory he defends.

Busolt's theory is clearly unsatisfactory, and Busolt gave tacit assent to this conclusion when he wrote the history of the years 466-450 without dating the catastrophe in Egypt as his system of reckoning demands. Furthermore, because of his theory he was forced to antedate the death of Aristagoras and to postdate the beginning of the Samian troubles and Pleistoanax' return from exile. Finally, he failed to notice that in the two passages where Thucydides states how many years had elapsed since the making of the Thirty Years' Truce, he took as his unit the year that began on the anniversary of the treaty.<sup>3</sup>

A reckoning of calendar years that excludes the *terminus a quo* is unsatisfactory in almost every instance. Consequently, inclusive reckoning of calendar years gives the correct dates except in three cases.<sup>4</sup> From the first passage, where Thucydides tells us that in the

<sup>1</sup> Busolt, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 298, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Busolt, *Ibid.*, p. 304; cf. 328. By Busolt's system of reckoning we must exclude the military year 459-458, in which he dates the intervention, from our six. The six years of fighting are therefore those from 458-457 to 453-452. The seventh, in which came the catastrophe, is 452-451, which is of course impossible. Nor does it help us to date the intervention in 460, the possibility of which Busolt admits, for in that case we cannot get back of 453 for the Athenian defeat; or if we should include the *terminus a quo*, a thing that Busolt thinks Thucydides never did, we could not go back of 454. Nor is the date 454 at all satisfactory.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 87; ii. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, vi. 59, might be cited as a fourth case. If I have interpreted it correctly, the only possible way of reconciling the statement that Hippias in the twentieth year of his exile accompanied the Persians to Marathon with an inclusive reckoning of calendar years is to assume that the number is approximate; but this assumption is contrary to Thucydides' custom of indicating carefully every approximation.

hundredth year approximately after the exile of the tyrants occurred the Revolution of the Four Hundred,<sup>1</sup> we learn not only that Thucydides was extremely careful to indicate every approximation but that an inclusive reckoning of calendar years was contrary to his usage. A second passage in which an inclusive reckoning of calendar years is impossible dates the expedition of Pleistoanax in the fifteenth year before the invasion of 431.<sup>2</sup> Our last example is the most instructive, for it is admitted even by Beloch, the protagonist for an inclusive reckoning of calendar years. It dates the first council at Sparta in the fourteenth year of the Thirty Years' Truce.<sup>3</sup> Comparing this with a similar passage where exclusive reckoning is unsatisfactory,<sup>4</sup> we see that Thucydides has counted from the making of the truce, paying no attention to anything except the *ἐνιαυτός* commencing on the day when the treaty was finally concluded. From these passages we learn that Thucydidean chronology is based primarily not upon tables of archons but upon *ἐνιαυτοί*.<sup>5</sup>

WHEATON COLLEGE,  
NORTON, MASSACHUSETTS

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* viii. 68.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 21.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* i. 87.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 2.

<sup>5</sup> The arguments I have advanced are based upon the assumption that Thucydides always reckoned in the same way. Although he may have varied his system of reckoning to suit the occasion, yet a careful study shows that no reason can be discovered for such variations. One might expect to find Busolt's system used in passages dealing with military affairs, but this is not the case, as we have seen from our survey of the campaigns between 466 and 450. Or we might assume with Beloch that Thucydides adopted the calendar year as his unit, at times shifting to *ἐνιαυτοί*, when this seemed more suitable; but this hypothesis finds no confirmation in the passages we have considered. Though there is still a further possibility, viz., that the passages which do not permit of an inclusive reckoning of calendar years are the result of carelessness and inaccuracy, this hypothesis cannot be maintained in view of the extreme pains taken by Thucydides to show that the one hundred years of viii. 68 were approximate. Consequently, he must have reckoned by *ἐνιαυτοί*.

## THE BRIDE OF HADES

By H. J. ROSE

In a well-known passage of Sophokles,<sup>1</sup> Antigone, going to her death, declares to the chorus that her bridal shall be with Acheron; and this image is by no means isolated. Several epitaphs call the death of an unmarried girl her wedding;<sup>2</sup> it was customary in Attica to put a *loutrophoros* (a large jar used for filling the nuptial bath), or a stone image of one, on the grave of a virgin; and we find now and then a young man spoken of as being married to Persephone.<sup>3</sup> Artemidoros again in his curious dreambook says that "marriage resembles death and is signified by death. . . . For a virgin to dream of marriage indicates her death; for all that happens to one who marries happens also to the dead."<sup>4</sup> Nor is this idea confined to classical Greece, by any means. To take but one example, if a Rumanian girl dies unmarried, she is dressed in bridal costume, and the *cortège* differs from a marriage procession only by the fact that those taking part have their clothes sewn with black thread and carry black handkerchiefs.<sup>5</sup> I propose briefly to inquire into the meaning of this belief, since it is apparent that it is not simply a metaphor.

One might connect it, perhaps, with *Todtenhochzeit*; but a little reflection will show that this is not satisfactory. In the first place, there is not a shadow of evidence that the belief relates only to girls whose intended husbands had died. They come under a quite different category, and I hope to discuss them elsewhere. Secondly, I know of no sufficient evidence for this custom in the Greek area. The tale of the sacrifice of Polyxena on the tomb of Achilles, as told for instance in Euripides' *Hecuba*, is quite different. Achilles had died before the actual capture of Troy, whose fall had been so largely due to his efforts and those of his son; naturally, therefore, his ghost

<sup>1</sup> Soph. *Ant.* 815; cf. 654 and Jebb *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup> E.g., *Anth. Pal.* vii. 182, 183, 185, 188, 492, 547.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 507b, 508; the latter epigram is attributed to Simonides.

<sup>4</sup> *Oneirokritika* ii. 65 (p. 156, 15 Hercher).

<sup>5</sup> Flachs, *Rumänische Hochzeits- und Totengebräuche*, pp. 46, 56.



claimed a share of the booty, which was given him in the shape of a valuable female slave, who was killed upon his tomb, not buried with him.

The next point to notice is that ordinary people do not marry deities, or have any sort of sexual connection with them, in normal Greek cult. The numerous tales of the amours of the gods represent them as having taken place in prehistoric times, and are for the most part readily explicable as local stories of a pair of deities fitted to the better-known Olympians; for instance, the affair of Zeus and Semele is the ancient tale of the marriage of Sky and Earth, with the modification that the bride of the Sky becomes his mistress because the Greek sky-god was already provided with a wife, Hera, and is not thought of as polygynous, for the excellent reason that his worshipers were not. When one hears of a ritual marriage with a god in which a mortal man or woman takes part, either it is from the fringes of the Greek world, as the offering of the bride's virginity to Scamander in the Troad,<sup>1</sup> or the god is a foreigner, as in the union of the king-archon's wife to Dionysos, at Athens,<sup>2</sup> or—and this is the interesting point—it is so very old as to have a claim to be pre-Hellenic, as in the marriage ceremony which seems to have formed part of the Eleusinian mysteries.<sup>3</sup> It is therefore reasonable to suppose (since there is no ground whatsoever for thinking it foreign) that we are dealing with a very old rite native to Greece, or to the Aegean district; which does not necessarily imply that it is native to the complex of races which we call the Greeks.

But here two difficulties meet us at once. First, what does Hades, a most respectable and monogynous Greek deity, and in addition, one who is very little worshiped, want with so many brides, especially in Attica, where he was not apparently worshiped at all, apart from the cult of Eubuleus at Eleusis? Secondly, if we go really far back, we find no god of the underworld for these girls to marry; for among the very old stratum of deities whose non-Greek names or whose appearance on Minoan monuments shows that they were there when

<sup>1</sup> Pseudo-Aeschines *Epist.* x. 680.

<sup>2</sup> See Farnell, *CGS*, V, 217.

<sup>3</sup> See, for the marriage, e.g., Tert. *Ad nat.* ii. 7; for the age of the mysteries, Persson in *ARW* (1922), pp. 287 ff.

the first of the Achaioi came, we find no such god at all, but only a goddess, in all probability Mother Earth herself. What is a goddess doing with wives?

And here we have yet another difficulty. Why is it, that of the various earth and under-world goddesses, one (Persephone) is an unwilling bride, while another (Artemis) and perhaps a third (Athena) are regularly said, in Greece, to be virgins? I have never been really satisfied with the explanation that these deities were, to begin with, simply unmarried; such a confusion does not seem likely in so clear-headed a people. Rather does it seem likely that, as Zeus is on occasion the Child whose parents are alive, the Farmer, and the Suppliant, and Hera is Maid, Wife, and Widow,<sup>1</sup> according to the condition of their worshipers, so Artemis is Maiden because of the early promise of maidens in her ritual. But as Artemis is also fertile, mother of many children in her various avatars (Kallisto, Atalanta, etc.), we come once more to a problem which I have elsewhere<sup>2</sup> tried to solve: Why is the fertile goddess especially worshiped by the infertile, and especially pleased with such worship?<sup>3</sup>

The answer will perhaps seem a little nearer if we consider another paradox: Why is a power of fertility particularly pleased with a sacrifice which checks fertility? Tellus Mater at Rome and the Eumenides at Sikyon<sup>4</sup> have sacrificed to them beasts great with young, and in the former instance, the Fordicidia, the embryo is used in magical ceremonial, conducted by the vestal virgins—again the infertile promoting fertility. Add to all this the Asiatic custom whereby the priests of the Great Mother are eunuchs, and the not unfrequent sacrifices of castrated beasts.<sup>5</sup>

Yet another instance. In the very ancient ritual of Artemis Triklaria at Patrai, Pausanias tells us, there was formerly an annual human sacrifice of the fairest youth and the fairest maid that could be found.<sup>6</sup> We need not take seriously the love-story which pro-

<sup>1</sup> See Aesch. *Choeph.* 394; Farnell, *op. cit.*, I, 66; *Higher Aspects*, p. 111.

<sup>2</sup> *Class. Quart.* (1924), pp. 11 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Compare the worship of Aphrodite at Sikyon by chaste priestesses (*Paus.* ii. 10. 4). Contrast her temple-harlots at Corinth.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 11. 4; Wissowa, *Rel. u. Kult.*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 145, 192; cf. p. 200.

<sup>5</sup> As in Roman ritual, see Krause, *De Romanorum hostiis*, pp. 12, 13, etc.

<sup>6</sup> *Paus.* vii. 19. 4.

fesses to account for the ritual, but that such ritual did once exist we need not doubt. Farnell's explanation, approved by Frazer in his note on the passage in Pausanias, is to my thinking obviously correct as far as it goes; it was intended to promote the fertility of the crops. But it is very noteworthy that the sacrifice consists of a potential bridal pair, whose youth and beauty seem to point them out as particularly likely to have noble offspring.<sup>1</sup>

I hold that in all these cases, except perhaps that of the castrated beasts, what is given to the deity is the unused fertility of the victim; the reproductive organs of the *gallos*, the power of having young which the cow and the sheep have already shown, the potential fertility of the Patrean lad and lass. My solution, so far as it relates to the cult of the Great Mother in Asia, has been in part anticipated by Mr. A. B. Cook,<sup>2</sup> and a friendly critic has suggested, and means, I understand, to publish his suggestion, that the magical power of chastity is a sufficient explanation. But why is chastity magically powerful? In itself it is a negative thing. I suggest that it is potent because it involves turning the great magical force of human fertility, unspent and unweakened by normal usage, into a magical channel. It does not seem possible to me that man can long have failed to notice either the immense energy of children below the age of puberty, or the fact that chastity in the adult is a necessary factor in attaining a high state of athletic "condition," a thing most necessary to the hunter and the warrior. His explanation would be that chastity increases *mana*; the particular sort of *mana* useful for fertility magic among other kinds.

But how is this to be diverted into the desired channel, increase of the fertility of the earth? One way I take it is that exemplified in the periodical carnivals of lustful indulgence ritually observed by sundry races usually decent in their conduct. But there are other ways. One is the eunuch's offering of the organ of generation; it is given to the goddess. This is done also in the case of some sacrifices of beasts.<sup>3</sup> But there is yet another way: to hand over the chaste

<sup>1</sup> Note also that Artemis Hymnia, in the Arcadian Orchomenos, is served by a priest and a priestess, who may have sexual relations neither with each other nor with any one else (*ibid.* viii. 13. 1).

<sup>2</sup> *Zeus*, I, 394-95.

<sup>3</sup> See Graillot, *Culte de Cybèle*, p. 156; and the legends collected by Hepding, *Attis*, pp. 31 ff.

person, or the beast whose fertility has not been allowed to attain its natural end, to the deity in question. This, I think, is what originally was supposed to happen in the case of the burial of an unmarried girl; her unused powers of reproduction went to swell the stock of fertility possessed by the earth-goddess. I am not sure that a similar idea had not something to do with the entombment alive of unchaste vestals; but their ritual is still too little known for dogmatism to be at all safe.

It seems likely also that the occasional tales, not all mythical, of the sacrifice of a virgin, proposed or carried out, to secure success in battle, go back to the same idea.<sup>1</sup> Luck is what the army about to engage particularly wants; and luck is closely allied to fertility, cf. the history of the word *felix*.<sup>2</sup>

Now to the Greeks, finding that the burial of a girl was somehow a fertility rite, and being accustomed to a male deity of the underworld who was not only a lord of souls but a giver of the good gifts of the earth (*Pluton*, *Plutos*) would surely envisage the matter thus, that the virgin was married to the earth-god. But this would soon create the difficulty already mentioned, namely, what the god of a monogynous race wanted with so many wives. Hence, I think, the tale of Kore being carried off by Hades; she is a kind of "projection" from the many human *kôrai* who had had the same experience. The identification of a dead girl with Kore which we find on some late monuments may be of earlier date than the mystic cults to which it properly belongs. Once Kore was established as queen of the underworld and wife of Hades, the old rite would be felt as little more than a metaphor, and hence we get the applications of it to the other sex already noted.<sup>3</sup>

#### ABERYSTWYTH, WALES

<sup>1</sup> As Makaria (Euripides *Herakleidae*) and the daughters of Erechtheus; for historical times, see Plut. *Pelopidas* 21.

<sup>2</sup> Root *FEL* as in *fellare*, "to suck"; hence e.g., *arbor felix*, "a fruitful tree"; then "lucky."

<sup>3</sup> Read before Section H of the British Association at their Toronto meeting, 1924.

## THE OSCAN CURSE OF VIBIA

BY ROLAND G. KENT

In 1876, in the excavations at ancient Capua, a rolled lead plate or tablet with an Oscan inscription was found. It was purchased by F. von Duhn, and by him presented to F. Bücheler, who had it unrolled and mounted in flat form, and after publication sent it to the Naples Museum, where it now is. The literature concerning it is as follows:

- F. Bücheler, *Oskische Bleischrift* (Frankfurt a. M., 1877), which is a separate print from *Rheinisches Museum*, XXX (1878), 1-77; with a lithographic plate.
- F. von Duhn, "Osservazione Campana," *Bulletino dell' Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica* (1878), p. 27.
- M. Bréal, *Revue critique*, XII (1878), 89-92.
- S. Bugge, "Die oskische Execrationsinschrift der Vibia," *Altitalische Studien*, I (Christiania, 1878), 1-60.
- I. Zvetiaieff, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Oscarum* (St. Petersburg and Leipzig, 1878), pp. 32-33, 152-53, with plate.
- E. Huschke, *Die neue oskische Bleitafel* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 1-75.
- G. F. Gamurrini, Appendix, p. 930, to A. Fabretti, *Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum antiquioris aevi* (Turin, 1867).
- G. A. Schrumpf, "The Oscan Inscription Discovered at Capua in 1876," *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London, 1882-84), pp. 378-89.
- O. A. Danielsson, in Pauli's *Altitalische Studien*, III (Hannover, 1884), 183-85.
- I. Zvetiaieff, *Inscriptiones Italiae Inferioris Dialectae* (Moscow and Leipzig, 1886), pp. 43-46.
- W. Deecke, *Altitalische Vermuthungen*, pp. 181-82, which is included with the preceding as an Appendix.
- C. Pascal, "La tavola osca di esecrazione," *Rendiconti della R. Accademia di archeologia lettere e belle arti di Napoli* (Nov. 21, 1894), pp. 1-26.
- R. von Planta, *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, II (Strassburg, 1897), 515-16, 625-29.
- R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects*, I (Cambridge, 1897), 124-28.
- R. Wünsch, in *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum: Appendix continens defixionum tabulas in Attica regione repertas* (Berlin, 1897), Praef. xxiv.
- F. Skutsch, adn. 1, to the preceding, Praef. xxiv.
- A. Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae* (Paris, 1904), pp. 257-68.
- C. D. Buck, *Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston, 1904), pp. 243-46.

Of all these, Bücheler and Bugge have done most for the interpretation of the text; Huschke was so erratic that only a few of his observations have value. Deecke has an independent translation, with a few new points, but added comparatively little. Pascal made one important discovery with regard to **VALAIMAS PUKLUM**, but that was about all he contributed. Conway and von Planta made new and painstaking examinations of the tablet, and their record is a valuable supplement to Bücheler's extremely accurate decipherment; von Planta added a convenient critical summary of previous studies. In convenient form, Audollent reprinted all previous essays at reading and interpretation, though with an occasional error therein. Buck recorded the reasonably certain results up to his time, and gave an independent judgment on them, with a few points of his own. The other publications have almost nothing of separate value.

The tablet, on being brought back into flat shape, showed one line of writing on the outer side, and twelve lines on the inside, all running from right to left. The tablet had been rolled in such a way that the beginnings of the lines were at the center of the roll; it is therefore the ends of the lines, or the left-hand side of the tablet, that have been destroyed by corrosion or by abrasion. The letters are in the Oscan alphabet, with minor irregularities in their forms; a number of words are misspelled, but some of the wrong letters were corrected on the tablet. The dotted **U** is found, but cannot be distinguished with certainty from the **U** without the dot, and it is necessary, with Bücheler and most editors, to disregard the distinction and write **U** in all instances. The **I** with the side stroke, which in the fully developed Oscan alphabet indicated an open *i*, is not used. The words are sometimes but not always separated by two dots or by a short vertical stroke.

It has been an alluring speculation, as I studied this inscription with successive classes of students, to essay the restoration of the ends of the lines, so that they should be of approximately equal length, and the meaning of the defective phrases and clauses should be completed. It is a hazardous attempt; others, notably Bugge, Huschke, Deecke, Pascal, have tried it, but I get different results, and therefore make bold to present them with the arguments on which they are based. My premise is that where the context did not indicate the



meaning of the missing words, formulaic repetition of other phrases in the tablet or the equivalents of phrases in other curse inscriptions should be utilized.

Despite the strictures of Bréal and of Huschke, Bücheler's work is the basis for all later studies and interpretations; and he did even better than he himself claims in his formal version of the text, with its translation into Latin, for in his commentary he made a considerable number of suggestions which he did not embody therein, though most of them have been accepted by later scholars. In my commentary, I shall endeavor to give credit first to him for all his readings and interpretations which are accepted, and also for those which have been used by later scholars as the foundation for improved versions; then to those who have corrected his errors or filled in his gaps, after which I plan to add my own small contribution. For convenience, I use the following typographical scheme: roman capitals, for letters clearly visible on the tablet; italic capitals, for letters more or less damaged, but visible in part; minuscules, for lost letters or restorations; asterisks, for lost letters, not restored; square brackets, to inclose wrongly inserted letters; italic capitals in pointed brackets, to show the corrections of miswritten letters; minuscules in pointed brackets, to show omitted letters.

When we look at the length of the lines, to see how much has been lost, we find that Bücheler thought line 3 complete by his restoration of **ARentikai inim**, and that line 6 was similarly complete with **PERFAkum herid nip**; also that 5 and 8 were complete with his interpretation, though he did not suggest the actual Oscan words. Now if we draw a vertical line on the tablet between **KERI** and **ARentikai** in 3, it will pass between (Bücheler's) **AKA** and **I** in 1, through **M** of **DAMIA** in 2, between **DU** and **NTEis** in 4, between **PUST** and **EISuk** in 5, through **R** of **PERFA** in 6, between **UFTE** and **IS** in 7, between **L** and **IMU** in 8, between **TURUMII** and **AD** in 9, between **PUKLUI** and **SUPR** in 10, between **HUNT** and **RUSA** in 11, between **TRUTA** and **S** in 12. For convenience, we count divided letters with the second half of the line. We find, then, that Bücheler added 13 or 14 letters after this dividing-line; Bugge added from 9 to 14; Huschke from 11 to 17; Deecke from 14 to 21, though we must judge mainly from a retranslation of his Latin version, since he gives no complete

Oscan text. With Pascal's discovery that the name **PAKIS KLU-VATIIS**, in the proper case, always preceded **VALAIMAS PUKLU-**, all these versions had to be discarded, since the proper name had to stand at the ends of lines 3, 7, 11, before the **VALAIMAS PUKLU-** that began lines 4, 8, 12. Pascal's own version added from 10 to 30 letters after our vertical divider. Von Planta and Conway were not primarily interested in making a restoration of the missing portions, nor was Buck; but the last-named apparently considered line 3 complete with 24 letters after the division.

As has been noted by others, every fresh line begins with a new word, and the ends of the lines are not necessarily precisely even; but any blank space at the end of a line may be expected to be not more than the length of the next word which is to be written. On the other hand, a long word at the end of the line might be abbreviated, as **PUK** is in the middle of line 9. Furthermore, the letters are not all of equal width, nor are they written so that they average the same width; in the twelve lines, before our vertical division, there are, respectively, 58, 60, 60, 62, 61, 53, 60, 49, 58, 57, 56, 57 letters, if we take no account of interpuncts. This suggests a maximum variation of about 20 per cent in the number of letters after the division; if we omit lines 6 and 8, we find a variation only from 62 down to 56, or 10 per cent. To this, something might be added for the sake of the next word, if it was evidently too long for the remaining space. Pascal's variation of from 10 to 30 letters is manifestly impermissible.

I shall next take up, line by line, the reconstruction of the missing portion of the text, with due credit to previous workers; but I shall leave the actual interpretation of the meaning until later. In my reconstruction, the additions after the vertical divider vary from 35 or 34 letters, down to 27, a variation which is within the limits just set on mechanical grounds. I place most confidence in my restorations of lines 1, 3, 7, with 34, 31, 32 letters, respectively, after the division.

- 1 **KERI ARENTikai mANAFUM PAI PUi [pUI] HERIAM SUVAM  
LEGINum suvam afLUKA- D Pakim kluvatium valaimas  
puklum inim**

To and including the second **suvam**, the readings and restorations are quite certain, though the second **PUI** is dittographic; so Bücheler

(pp. 67-68). Deecke and Pascal set **suvam** in the place of the second **PUI**, and restore differently after **LEG/Num**; but the space is entirely inadequate for **suvam**. The last preserved characters of the line were read by Bücheler as **AKA** and a vertical hasta; by Bugge as **AKAR**, restoring **esAKARatus aflukid**; by Huschke as **-UN LA-**, which may be passed by; by Deecke as **PAKIm kluvatiium inim**; by Pascal as **pakim kluvatiIUM Aflukad inim**; by Buck as **aflAKAD**. Von Planta and Conway venture no versions of their own.

Out of this tangled jungle, it is clear that, as Bugge saw, a verb for the relative clause is needed, and it is probably a form of **AFLUKAD**, which in line 3 immediately follows **LEGINUM**, and apparently governs that word as object; and that, as Deecke saw, the name of Pacius Cluatus should be found here, as chief object of the curse, before it occurs in the second line in a subordinate function. To this we may add the probability that the name of Pacius was followed, as Pascal first recognized, by the usual phrase **VALAIMAS PUKLU-**, and that, as Deecke first conjectured, an "and" followed it.

The testimony of others and of my own examination of the lithographic facsimile leads me to regard the characters remaining at the end of the line, as the lower part of an uncertain mark; a distinct **U** or **L**; a much miswritten and overwritten character, which may be almost anything, even a ligature of two letters; a distinct **A**; a vertical hasta with remnants of the other lines of **D**; the bottom parts of two vertical lines, which may well be a mutilated **P**. Thus we have **aflUKAD Pakim** as a possibility, which accords with the other evidence and has been included in the restoration above, which contains 34 letters after the vertical dividing-line.

- 2 **USURS INIM MALAKS N<E>STRUS PAKIU<i> KLUVATIUI**  
**VALA<i>MA[I]S Puklui ANTKADUM DA- MIAd pesemad**  
**pai pui suvam heriam suvam**

The **I** of **NISTRUS** is probably a miswriting for **E**; cf. Buck, § 38, 4. The last character of **KLUVATIUI** is distinctly an **I**, though there is a gap between it and the interpunct, which caused Bücheler to read it as a mutilated **D**. Bugge took it to be an ablative, in an absolute phrase with **DAMIantud**. Huschke, Pascal, and Buck accept it as a dative. Von Planta is non-committal, though seeming to prefer

the dative to an ablative, which also is possible with a word meaning "nearer." Conway thought that he saw distinct traces of an **M** as the final letter. At any rate, **PAKIU** and **Puklu-** accord in case with **KLUVATIUI**, and **PAKIU** lacks a final letter. **VALAMAIS** lacks an **I** in the second syllable, as Bücheler saw, and has an extra **I** in the ultima, as Bugge recognized.

After this, Bücheler read **ANIKADUM**, with but the faintest trace of the **D** preserved. Bugge assumed that a crossbar had been lost in the third character, and read **ANT KADUM**, in which he is followed by Deecke and by Pascal. Huschke divided **ANIKAD UM**. Von Planta follows Bücheler, admitting the possibility of **T**. Conway could see only three vertical hastas, followed by **K\*\*\*M**. Buck reads **ANTKADUM** as one word.

At the end of the line, as Bugge and Deecke recognized, **suvam** should stand, modifying the **LEGINUM** which begins the third line. In fact, the **LEGINUM AFLUKAD** of line 3 suggest that we have a repetition of the relative clause which stands in the first line, with **suvam** before its nouns instead of after, as in the single line on the outside of the tablet.

Space is left for two words, part of the first being preserved. Bugge proposed **DAMI***Antud, demeante*; Huschke, **DAMI***atum, subactum*; Deecke, **DAMI***ad, domet*; Pascal, **DAMI**<ai> *Heriid, Damiae velit*; von Planta, **DAMI***ai, Damiae*; Buck, **DAMIA-**, "damnum." I suggest **DAMI***ad pesemad*, an ablative phrase of manner; for the phrase, cf. Livy xxii. 53. 11: *tum me Iuppiter . . . pessimo leto adficiat*. This gives 33 letters after the vertical.

3 **LEGINUM AFLUKAD IDIK TFEI MANAFUM VIBIIAI PRE-  
BAIAM PUKULUM DAdAD KERI ARentikai manafum  
pakim kluvatiium**

I have adopted Bücheler's suggestion for the uncertain **PREBAI-AMPU\*ULUM**, in which he is followed by Huschke and by Deecke. Bugge proposed **PREBAI AMPUIULUM**, which is adopted by von Planta and by Buck. Pascal suggests **PREBAIAM PUz ULUM**. Bücheler's **DAdAD** is followed by all but Huschke and Pascal, who give **DAdiD**.

Bücheler's **ARentikai** is certain, and is accepted by all. Pascal recognized that the **VALAIMAS PUKLUM** at the beginning of

line 4 required a **PAKIM KLUVATIUM** at the end of line 3, which is accepted by later editors. Huschke felt the need of a verb in the gap at the end of this line, with *mando* as its meaning; von Planta suggested the need of a verb meaning *devoveo*, in the same place; Buck thought that the equivalent of *mandavi* was to be implied. One is inclined to ask why it should not be set in the text. **MANAFUM** gives this meaning, and with its insertion, there are just 31 letters after our vertical divider.

- 4 **VALAIMAS PUKLUM INIM ULAS LEGINEI SVAI NEIP DA-  
DID LAMATIR AKRID EISEIS DU- NTEis kurups sulum  
inim dumatir**

All editors have recognized that the obvious completion of **DUNTE** is by adding **is**, making, according to nearly all, a genitive singular; but they interpret the word variously. After this a subject is needed for the verbs, as Bugge first observed, suggesting the equivalent of Latin *cinis*; Pascal thought that it might be a word meaning *corpus*. The latter view I have adopted, making a hypothetical Oscan word, equivalent phonologically to Latin *corpus*; for the use of *corpus* in curses, see M. Jeanneret, *La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines* (Paris and Neuchâtel, 1918), page 109. The line is however not yet filled out by some 15 to 20 letters, if we may judge from the previous lines. A reasonable conjecture is a word meaning "all," modifying **\*kurups**, and an additional verb, with the conjunction "and." I have thought of **\*dumatir**, which rhymes with **LAMATIR** and alliterates with **DUNTEis**, even as the two verbs in the next line rhyme and alliterate with each other. With this, the portion of the line after the vertical amounts to 27 letters.

- 5 **INIM KAISPATAR Inim KRUSTATAR SVAI NEIP AVT SVAI  
TIUM IDIK FIFIKUS PUST EISuk pun kahad svemnum  
avt diirnum**

Thus Bücheler, inclusive of **EISuk**, after which he wished to restore an infinitive meaning *feri*. Bugge, taking **TIUM** as accusative, favored **PUST EISui** with an infinitive equal to *facere*, "that you will do this afterward to him"; wherein the dative **EISui** should, as von Planta points out, more probably be **EISei**. Huschke has **EISeis**.

Deecke, Pascal, and von Planta favor **EISuk**. Deecke, restoring **NuhtiRNUM** in the next line, proposed the equivalent of *somnum diurnum* at the end of this line. In view of the **AVT NuhtiRNUM** in 6, to which a contrast must be sought, this seems a very satisfactory conjecture, essentially. If we are to seek Oscan equivalents for the two words, we may make phonetically *\*svemnum* = *somnum* from *\*svepnom*, and *\*diirnum* after **NuhtiRNUM**, the doubtful quality of which is somewhat lessened by its probable occurrence in line 12. *\*Diirnum* and *nuhtirnum* rhyme even as do *diurnus* and *nocturnus*, and have the ending of *hibernus*, *vernus*, *veternus*, *modernus*, *hodiernus*, *hesternus*, and other adjectives of time. I take **PUST EISuk**, however, as referring to the preceding clauses, and therefore do not restore an infinitive, but conjecture

pun kahad svemnum avt diirnum | **AVT NuhtiRNUM**,

with repetition of the **PUN KAHAD** before the second **AVT**. This restoration gives 30 letters in the fifth line, after our vertical divider.

6 **PUN KAHAD AVT NuhtiRNUM NEIP PUTIAD PUNUM KAHAD**  
**AVT SVAI PID PE- RFakium kahad pust eisuk fakium**  
**neip**

The interpuncts in **PUTII:AD** were recognized as wrong by Bücheler, and those in **PUN:UM** by Bréal, whose lead all later editors have followed, except Huschke, who apparently did not know the work of Bréal nor that of Bugge. For the fourth word of the line, Bugge conjectured **NeneRNUM**, *virilitate carens*; Huschke made a very wild guess; Deecke suggested **NuhtiRNUM**, which commends itself to me, though other editors since Deecke have held aloof. At the end of the line, Bücheler suggested **PERFAkum** or **PERFAkium herid neip**; Bugge, **PERFAhtum id ni**; Huschke, **PERFAkum kahad neip**; Deecke, in Latin translation, *perfi(cere vult, ne)*; Pascal, **PERFAhtum id neip**. Von Planta remarks that a present subjunctive or a future indicative is needed in the **SAI** clause, but otherwise agrees essentially with Bücheler; so also does Buck. My restoration follows Bücheler in the main, but accepts Huschke's **kahad**, which is a subjunctive and occurs in other clauses, and inserts **pust eisuk** in imitation of **PUST EISuk** of line 5, where it stands immediately after



a SVAI clause, and then an infinitive depending on the PUTIAD of 7. 7. This makes 31 letters after the vertical divider.

7 PUTIAD NIP HUNTRUIS NIP SUPRUIS AISUSIS PUTIANS  
PIDUM PUTIANS UFTE- IS UDFakium nestrus pakiui  
kluvatiui

The text, inclusive of UDF, is that of Bücheler, who recognized that PUTIANS requires a plural subject from some source and an infinitive in the gap at the end of the line. The infinitive seems to most editors to lurk in UDF, of which Bugge makes UDFakium *odefacere, olfacere*; Deecke makes UDFakum *valere*; Pascal makes UDFakium *proficere*. The last of these seems best. Bugge and Huschke found the subject in AISUSIS; Deecke divided AISUS IS, *sacrificia eius*, and made AISUS the subject of the first PUTIANS, and UFTEIS the subject of the second. Pascal follows Deecke, but regards AISUSIS as a single word. Von Planta finds the subject in NISTRUS of line 2, or in the gap; Buck indicates an ellipsis of *propinqui*, which would be nistrus. Writing it, however, in the correct spelling, I insert nestrus, and follow it with pakiui kluvatiui, which, as Pascal recognized, must come at the end of the line before the VALAIMAS PUKLUI of 8. I regard the second PUTIANS as a mere repetition, since PIDUM and other forms of this compound, which occurs also in the Tabula Bantina and in the Cippus Abellanus, always have indefinite meaning, not subordinating; and a subordinate clause here, "whatever they may be able <to do>," would lack appropriateness. The restorations give the line 32 letters after the dividing vertical.

8 VALAIMAS PUKLUI PUN FAR KAHAD NIP PUTIAD EDUM  
NIP MENVUM L- IMU<m> Pidum putiad sulum eisunk  
pafium

Here the meaning of the missing part is simple. Bücheler, for PI and the lost words, gave *durch irgend eines der Mittel*, PAI HUMUNS BIVUS KARANTER, the last four words being those commencing the next line. Bugge put this into Oscan as Pidum eisunk, etc., with Pidum as ablative. Huschke suggested Pafuis perum, "by the foods [cf. Latin *pabulum*] through which . . ."; but perum, which he

wishes to govern **PAI** in the next line, means "without."<sup>1</sup> Deecke, Pascal, von Planta, and Buck all approve Bücheler's meaning, with or without accepting Bugge's text precisely. It remains only to fill out the whole gap, the length of which has been pretty definitely determined by lines 1, 3, 7; I suggest the restoration above, in which the subjunctive is repeated in the second part of the main clause, and the adjective "all" and a neuter substantive for "foods" are added. For the last word, I utilize Huschke's conjecture, since no Oscan word of this meaning actually occurs. This makes 32 letters after the dividing-line.

- 9 **PAI HUMUNS BIVUS KARANTER SULUH PAKIS KLUVATIIS**  
**VALAIM<a>S PUK TURUMII-** AD Luvfrum idik estud  
 inim prufum

Bücheler recognized the **L** at the edge of the tablet, with what might be a **U** somewhat below; this latter letter might, as he himself noted, belong rather to the last preserved word of line 10. Its position, according to the lithographed plate, indicates that the latter supposition is correct. Bugge proposed **Luvfrum**, which he connected with the dative **VIBIIAI AKVIIAI** of line 10, comparing the formula *ἐμοὶ δὲ δῶτα καὶ ἐλείθερα εἰη πάντως* of the curse-tablets of Cnidos.<sup>2</sup> Huschke accepted this general sense, but Deecke made another restoration, *id perficias*, which is unacceptable. Pascal restored **LUvfrum idik estud**, taking the letter after **L** with this line. Von Planta mentions the restoration **Luvfrum**, apparently with approval, and Buck accepts the meaning *liberum . . . sit*. I accept Pascal's extension of Bugge's **Luvfrum**, and add a second adjective, to correspond with the two adjectives of the Greek formula. The restoration above contains 28 letters after the vertical divider.

- 10 **VIBIIAI AKVIIAI SVAI PUH AFLAKUS PAKIM KLUVATIUM**  
**VALAIMAS PUKLU<M>** SUPRus teras tuvai heriai  
 sakrim

This line has resisted editors better than the preceding lines. Bugge took the dubious character which Pascal associated with the line above, as a mutilated **R**, belonging to this line, where **R** is cer-

<sup>1</sup> Tabula Bantina, ll. 5, 14, 21.

<sup>2</sup> A. Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae*, pp. 5-19.

tainly needed after **SUP-**. Bugge saw also that the **HUNTRUS TERAS**, as he divided the letters in the next line, gave a clue to this phrase, and suggested **SUPRus**, *ad superos*, followed by a genitive meaning *caeli* or the like. Huschke took **HUNTRUSTERAS** as one word, meaning *unterweltlich*, and restored **SUPRusteras**, *oberweltlich*. Deecke's version, *supra terram*, implies a text **SUPRus teras**. Pascal's **SUPRuis** is not so good, as the two **SVAI PUH** clauses imply parallelism of phrasing as far as possible. Von Planta and Buck accept the meaning *supra* as probable, which implies **SUPRus**.

From the parallelism of the clauses we may accept **SUPRus teras**. As **LEG/Num** was preceded by **HERIAM** in line 1, where Ceres Arentica was subject to the verb, it is reasonable to infer that such was the situation here, where line 11 has **TUVAI LEGINEI**; hence, I restore **tuvai heriai** in the gap at the end of line 10. Further, in **INIM TUVAI LEGINEI INIM SAKRIM**, the second **INIM** seems but a repetition, hard to interpret in any logical way. Omitting it, we have **TUVAI LEGINEI SAKRIM** in 11 after **INIM**, "and"; this suggests not merely **tuvai heriai** in 10, but **tuvai heriai sakrim**, which satisfactorily fills the gap after **SUPRus teras**, giving 28 letters after the vertical division.

- 11 **INIM TUVAI LEGINEI [INIM] SAKRIM SVAI PUH AFLAKUS**  
**HUNTRUS TERAS HUNT-      RUS Apas sakrim pakim klu-**  
**vatium**

As has just been said, the second **INIM** is probably dittographic. **HUNTRUS TERAS** seems to be the correct word division. Bücheler rejected this possibility because he was unable to explain **HUNTRUS** as a preposition; he divided **HUNTRU STERAS**, and was equally unable to explain **STERAS**. Huschke made one word of **HUNTRUSTERAS**, as was noted; but Bugge divided **HUNTRUS TERAS**, and interpreted *ad inferos terrae*, in which he was followed by Pascal. Deecke, following Bugge's division, rendered *infra terram*, in which he is followed by von Planta and by Buck, though an uncertainty remains whether **TERAS** is genitive singular or accusative plural. After this, Bücheler read **HUNTRU SA\*\***; Bugge suggested **HUNTRUS Apasum**, *ad inferos aquarum*, which is followed by Pascal, and approved, with reserves, by von Planta. Huschke's **HUNTRUSAKrim** is hardly ac-

ceptable; nor is Deecke's **HUNTRUis sAkrim**, even though the **S** is nearly obliterated, for the space does not suffice for three letters.

To me, it seems natural that after **HUNTRUS TERAS** we should have **HUNTRUS Apas**, rather than **Apasum**, with **Apas** in the same number as **TERAS**. This might be followed by **sakrim** as in the alternative clause. Finally, because of the initial words in line 12, we must restore **pakim kluvatium**. The two **SVAI PUH** clauses now run parallel, but the second lacks the datives **tuwai heriai . . . INIM TUVAI LEGINEI**, and contains two **HUNTRUS** phrases instead of one; the first clause has **SAKRIM** twice, the second has it once; the first contains the personal name immediately after the verb, the second has it at the end. There are 28 letters after the vertical division.

12 VALAIMA[I]S PUKLU<m> AVT KERI ARE<n>Tikai AVT  
ULAS LEGINEI NUHTIRNAS TRUTA- S TUSz fuid pakis  
kluvatiis valaimas puk

The failure to write the final **m** of **PUKLU**, and the omission of the fourth letter of **ARE<n>Tikai** were noted by Bücheler; the erroneous insertion of the **I** in the final syllable of **VALAIMAIS** was recognized by Bugge. Huschke emended to **PUKLU<i>**, but otherwise these corrections have been accepted by all editors.

The fragmentary letters after **LEGINEI** were read by Bücheler as probably **NUH\*IRNAS**, with the third, sixth, and last two fairly certain. For the fourth, he suggested **E** or **V**; the remnant of this letter and of the following **I** might together form a mutilated **P**. Yet as he states the visible part to be only the upper right part of an **E** or **V**, I feel justified in adopting Bugge's **NUHTIRNAS**. Pascal also follows Bugge in this point, but reads only **\*UHTIRNAS**. Others read but a few scattered letters.

The restoration at the end of the line depends upon the interpretation of the preceding words and their division into phrases and sentences. In connection with line 11, I have expressed a belief that the second **SVAI PUH** clause ended with **PUKLU**. Certainly, with Ceres Arentika addressed in the second person as subject to the verb, the dative of her name in 12 could not properly be the indirect object, but must be included in the next clause or sentence. Hereafter comes a genitive, perhaps expressing the time within which. A verb is needed, and we have but **TUS**; restoration can be only free and fanciful. **TUS** may be **TUSz** = Latin *tostus*, and the rest follows easily, with the

nominative **puk** abbreviated as in line 9. This makes 35 lines after the vertical divider; but **valaimas** may be abbreviated by the omission of the last vowel, as in line 9, or even to **val**, or the last few letters may have been crowded to avoid running over into the next line.

An alternative restoration for line 11 seems worth chronicling. The second **SVAI PUH** clause may have ended with **HUNTRUS Apas**, or the final words may have been **HUNTRU SAKrim**, with the **HUNTRU** a mere dittography. After this, there may have been **manafum**, with its object and the two datives, the sentence ending with **LEGINEL**. The last sentence, in 12, I reconstruct as before. With this text, line 11 would have 29 or 30 letters after the vertical division.

Of all these additions to complete the lines, very few are without the authority of previous editors or of formulaic repetition. I can fairly claim the credit or be charged with the blame of **DAMIAd pesemad** 2, **inim domatir** 4, **TUSz fuid** 12, along with the filler **sulum** in 4 and 8, but with no more than these. Further, the length of the lines, in number of letters before and after the vertical division, is as follows:

Line.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Letters before.....	58	60	60	62	61	53	60	49	58	57	56	57
Letters after.....	34	33	31	27	30	31	32	32	28	28	28	35

The single line on the outside of the tablet may be thus restored:

**KERI ARENTIKAi mn PAI PUI SUVA Heriam suva LEGINum aflukad  
lamatir KRUS- tatar pakis kluvatiis valaimas puk**

In this, I have myself added **mn**, to fill properly the gap at that point, as abbreviation of **MANAFUM**, and the name at the end, as subject to the last two verbs. Bugge inserted the second **suva** and **aflukid lamatir**; I have improved to **aflukad**. The remainder stands to Bücheler's credit. The possessive adjective lacks the final **m** of the accusative, like **LIMU** 8 and **PUKLU** 12 on the other side. There are 31 letters after the vertical division, which falls after **KRUS-**, and 60 before it.

I desire now to present my complete text of the inscription, with a Latin version; the division into phrases and clauses will be shown by the punctuation of the Latin. I would give also some general considerations with regard to the meaning, followed by a complete rendering into English, since Latin versions of difficult dialect inscriptions are often almost as hard to understand as the originals; and then I would conclude this already too lengthy commentary with such notes on special words as may be desirable to justify my rendering.

## OSCAN TEXT

- 1 KERI ARENTikai mANAFUM PAI PU*i* [p*UI*] HERIAM SUVAM LEGINum  
suvam afLUKA- D Pakim kluvatiium valaimas puklum inim
- 2 USURS INIM MALAKS N <E>STRUS PAKIU <i> KLUVATIUI VALA <i>MA[I]s  
Puklui ANTKADUM DA- Mlad pesemad pai pui suvam heriam suvam
- 3 LEGINUM AFLUKAD IDIK TFEI MANAFUM VIBIIAI PREBAIAM PUKULUM  
DAdaD KERI AREntikai manafum pakim kluvatiium
- 4 VALAIMAS PUKLUM INIM ULAS LEGINEI SVAI NEIP DADID LAMATIR  
AKRID EISEIS DU- NTEis kurups sulum inim dumatir
- 5 INIM KAISPATAR Inim KRUSTATAR SVAI NEIP AVT SVAI TIUM  
IDIK FIFIKUS PUST EISuk pun kahad svemnum avt diirnum
- 6 PUN KAHAD AVT NuhtIRNUM NEIP PUTIAD PUNUM KAHAD AVT  
SVAI PID PE- RFakium kahad pust eisuk fakium neip
- 7 PUTIAD NIP HU*n*TRUIS NIP SUPRUIS AISUSIS PUTIANS PIDUM  
PUTIANS UFTE- IS UDFakium nestrus pakiui kluvatiui
- 8 VALAIMAS PUKLUI PUN FAR KAHAD NIP PUTIAD EDUM NIP  
MENVUM L- IMU <m>PIDum putiad sulum eisunk<sup>1</sup>pafium
- 9 PAI HUMUNS BIVUS KARANter SULUH PAKIS KLUVATIIS VALAIM <a>S  
PUK TURUMII- AD Luvfrum idik estud inim prufum
- 10 VIBIIAI AKVIIAI SVAI PUH AFLAKUS PAKIM KLUVATIUM  
VALAIMAS PUKLU <M> SUPRus teras tuvai heriai sakrim
- 11 INIM TUVAI LEGINEI [INIM] SAKRIM SVAI PUH AFLAKUS HUNTRUS  
TERAS HUNT- RUS Apas sakrim pakim kluvatiium
- 12 VALAIMA[I]S PUKLU <m> AVT KERI ARE <n> Tikai AVT ULAS LEGINEI  
NUHTIRNAS TRUTA- S TUSz fuid pakis kluvatiis valaimas puk

## LATIN VERSION

- 1 Cereri Ultrici mandavi—quae qui [qui] vim suam, cohortem  
suam adferat—Pacium Cluatium Valaemae filium et
- 2 osores et malevolos propinquos Pacio Cluatio Valaemae  
filio, ut-cadant nece pessima—quae qui suam vim, suam
- 3 cohortem adferat—id tibi mandavi. Vibiae Prebaeam puellam  
reddat: Cereri Ultrici mandavi Pacium Cluatium
- 4 Valaemae filium et illius cohorti, si non reddiderit. Caesum sit  
acriter eius devoti corpus totum et domitum sit
- 5 et caespitibus tegitor et crustator, si non (reddiderit). At si tu  
id decreveris, post ea cum paret somnum aut diurnum
- 6 cum paret aut nocturnum, ne possit, quandoque paret. At  
si quid perficere paret, post ea facere ne
- 7 possit. Neque inferis neque superis sacrificiis possint, quicquam  
possint optati efficere propinqui Pacio Cluatio
- 8 Valaemae filio. Cum far paret, neve possit edere, neve  
minuere famem quoquam possit omnium eorum pabulorum
- 9 quae homines vivi vescuntur. Omnino Pacius Cluatus Valaemae  
fil. torqueatur: liberum id esto et probum
- 10 Vibiae Acuviae. Sive attuleris Pacium Cluatium  
Valaemae filium supra terram tuae vi hostiam
- 11 et tuae cohorti [et] hostiam, sive attuleris infra  
terram infra aquam hostiam Pacium Cluatium
- 12 Valaemae filium, aut Cereri Ultrici aut illius cohorti  
intra noctem quartam tostus fuerit Pacius Cluatus Valaemae fil.



Some general considerations are of importance for this rendering. The curse is addressed to Ceres Arentica, a nether-world goddess of vengeance, by one Vibia Acuvia, against Pacius Cluatus, "son of Valaema," for a theft, and is to be effective if he does not give back the stolen object; so much is clear, and other matters of detail will be discussed under the separate words. Ceres is now addressed in the second person, now spoken of in the third; witness the changes from the one to the other in the first and the last sentences. Vibia speaks now in the first person (**MANAFUM** 1, 3), now in the third (**VIBIAI** 3, 10); unless we are to take **MANAFUM** as spoken by a professional sorcerer or sorceress, composing the curse on behalf of Vibia, which I regard as a distinct possibility.

The sentences are, as is natural, expressed in a rather incoherent way, yet can be reduced to a reasonable succession of thoughts. The first sentence ends with **MANAFUM** 3, for **IDIK** refers to the preceding (see note below); the repeated relative clause of purpose is more or less parenthetical, to call attention to the form of the activity of the avenging goddess. The second sentence consists of a summons for restitution, and an imprecation, if restitution is not made; the conditional clause is distinctly needed at its end. The third sentence gives that which is desired for Pacius, if he does not make return of the stolen object; it also distinctly needs the condition. Further, if the abbreviated **SVAI NEIP** of 5 be taken with the following, we have two "if" clauses which are not logical alternatives, and are connected by **AVT**, which apparently means "or" in this inscription, but only as correlative to another **AVT** (on this point, cf. details below).

The fourth sentence begins with **AVT SVAI THUM FIFIKUS**, as a mark of deference to the avenging goddess, and goes on with the sufferings which Pacius is to have before he is ultimately done to death and buried, as was asked in the third sentence. He may neither sleep nor accomplish anything nor eat with satisfaction; his relatives may not be able to avail him by sacrifices. The sentence divisions are clear, down to line 10; here it becomes a problem whether the two **SVAI PUH AFLAKUS** clauses are to be attached to the preceding or to the following. I have taken them with the following, because the last sentence then becomes a summary of the whole curse: "In

whichever fashion thou shalt lay him low, let Pacius be withered away [TUSz] within the fourth night."

The following, accordingly, would be my rendering into English:

- (1) To Ceres the Avenger have I consigned—(to the one) who, female (or) male, shall direct her force, her host (thereto)—Pacius Cluatius child of the Valaema, and (2) (my) haters and ill-wishers, kinsmen to Pacius Cluatius child of the Valaema, to perish by the worst destruction—who,
- (3) female (or) male, shall direct her force, (3) her host (thereto)—this (task) have I consigned to thee. To Vibia let her surrender up the child Prebaea; to Ceres the Avenger have I consigned Pacius Cluatius
- (4) (4) child of the Valaema and to her host, if he does not surrender her. Let the whole body of this doomed man be lashed severely, and
- (5) overpowered, (5) and let it be covered with sods, and buried, if (he does) not. Moreover if thou hast made this decision, after this, when
- (6) he makes ready for sleep either by day, (6) when he makes ready (for sleep) or by night, let him not be able (to sleep), whenever he makes ready (for it). Moreover if he makes ready to accomplish anything,
- (7) after this let him not be able to do (it). (7) Neither by sacrifices to (the gods) below nor (by sacrifices to the gods) above let them be able, let the kinsmen be able to achieve anything desirable for Pacius
- (8) Cluatius (8) child of the Valaema. When he makes bread ready, let him not be able to eat, nor let him be able to lessen (his) hunger by
- (9) any of all those foods (9) which living men feed upon. In every way let Pacius Cluatius child of the Valaema be tortured; (but) free let this be,
- (10) and fair, (10) for Vibia Acuvia. Whether thou shalt have directed Pacius
- (11) Cluatius child of the Valaema above earth (as) victim to thy force, (11) and (as) victim to thy host, or thou shalt have directed under the earth,
- (12) under the water, (as) victim Pacius Cluatius (12) child of the Valaema, either by Ceres the Avenger or by her host, within the fourth night, shriveled away be Pacius Cluatius child of the Valaema.

It remains now to give such commentary on the separate words as seems desirable, so far as this has not been done in other connections. For convenience, the words will be discussed in their first occurrence, whether that be in the preserved or in the restored portion of the tablet.

1. **MANAFUM**: *mandavi*, with Bü. vPl. Con. Bk.; Bg. *mandavimus*, H. *subreptum*, De. Pa. *mando*.

1. **HERIAM** . . . **LEG/Num**: *vim* Pa. Bk., and *cohortem* Bg. Bk. Others vary considerably, though within a limited range. The

interpretation here taken is that **HERIA-** denotes the personal activity of Ceres herself, while the **LEGIN-** is her host of subordinate spirits, to whom she may delegate her work of vengeance. Thus, where Ceres is subject (**afLUKAD** 1, **AFLUKAD** 3, **AFLAKUS** 10, 11), the **HERIA-** and the **LEGIN-** are both named; but the **HERIA-** is omitted where Ceres and the **LEGIN-** are directly associated by an "and" (3-4) or by an "or" (12).

1. **afLUKAD** (and **AFLUKAD** 3, **AFLAKUS** 10, 11): Bü. *deferre*; Bg. *adigere*; H. *affligere*; De. *abripere*; Pa. *deferre, immittere*; Con. *\*ablegere, abducere*; Bk. *afferre*. Though Bugge, followed by Pascal, takes it as governing a direct object of the person and another accusative without a preposition, as a goal, it seems rather to be one of those verbs which may take either of two ideas as direct object, the remaining one being expressed by a dative or by an ablative or by a prepositional phrase. Cf. *circumdet brachia collo*, Ov. *Met.* ix. 459, and *collum circumdare filo*, Cat. lxiv. 377; *ossibus implicet ignem*, Verg. *Aen.* i. 660, and *crinem implicat auro*, *Aen.* iv. 148; and also the usages with *donare, abstergere, detergere*, and in many verbs where the relation is virtually mutual, as in Cicero's witticism ap. Macr. *Sat.* ii. 3. 3, *quis generum meum ad gladium adligavit?* Thus in 1 and 3 **HERIAM** and **LEGINUM** seem to be the objects of **AFLUKAD**, but **PAKIM KLUVATIUM** is the object of **AFLAKUS** in 10 and in 11. The dative **LEGINEI** in 11 indicates a transference of the direct object of 1 and of 3 to the function of the indirect object. The most probable etymology, accordingly, is that it contains the equivalents of Latin *ad* and *flecto*; cf. Buck § 97a, § 139. 1, and *Vokalismus d. osk. Spr.*, page 116, also Bugge, pages 14-15, whose argument makes for *ad* rather than for *ab* as prior element.

1. **pakim**: Bü. Bg. H. De. Pa. render as "Paquius"; vPl. Con. Bk. as "Pacius," which is obviously preferable. Cf. W. Schulze, *Gesch. latein. Eigennamen*, page 204.

1. **kluvatiium**: the normalized Latin form of this name would seem to be "Cluatius"; so Bü. Bg. H. Pa. But De. has "Cluvatius," and Pl. and Bk. have "Clovatius." Cf. Schulze, *op. cit.*, page 483, and Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenc. d. kl. Alt.*, s.v. "Cloatius." The gens is known also from the *jovila*-inscriptions of Capua.

1. **valaimas puklum**: found six times, in various cases, in the pre-

served part of the tablet. Bü. *Di Manes*; Bg. *Optimae purgamentum*; H. *valetudinis percussus* (!); De. *Persephoniae piaculum*; Pa. *Valemae filius*, virtually accepted by vPl. Bk.; Con. *optimae puerorum* = the Furies. Bücheler took **VALAIMAS** as nom. acc. dat.-abl.,<sup>1</sup> meaning "best," as shown by *valaemo-* in the Tabula Bantina, with either an appositive or a genitive of the whole, meaning "children," this word being either neuter like Greek τέκνον or epicene like Latin *puer* in early times; he took the phrase, then, as a euphemism for a set of infernal demons, cf. Εὐμενίδες, "Kindly Ones" = the Furies. Bugge propounded the view, accepted by all later editors but Conway, that **VALAIMAS** is a genitive, depending on the other word. **VALAIMAS** means, then, "of Valaema," as a proper name, or "of the Best One," euphemistic for Persephone. **PUKLU-**, which even Bücheler took to mean "child," comparing Latin *puer*, was taken by Bugge and by Deecke to mean an atonement offering, with the root as in *purus* and *putus*, "clean." The alternatives seem to be "son of Valaema" and "atonement offering to Persephone." The direct equation of **PUKLU-** with Sanskrit *putrá-*, "son," not made by Bücheler, but made in 1879 by G. Curtius in *Grundzüge d. griech. Etym.*<sup>5</sup>, page 287, is convincing, in view of the occurrences of the word in other Italic dialects. Yet to take *Valaema*, with Pascal, as the name of Pacius' mother, is astonishing. The relative clauses in the Greek curse from Cumae,<sup>2</sup> which Pascal cites, are hardly precise parallels: Οὐαλέριαν Κοδράτιλλαν ἣν ἔτεκεν Οὐαλερία Εὐνοία ἣν ἔσπειρε Οὐαλέριος Μυστικός; and so far as I am aware, we have no other definition of an Italian by his mother's name. The name *Valaema*, or the Latin *Optima*, is not known as a praenomen, though, as Pascal points out, both gentilicia such as *Valerius* and cognomina such as *Vala* and *Valens* are found from this root.<sup>3</sup> In view of these peculiarities, may it rather be that Vibia calls him, by prolepsis, "child of the Queen of the Dead," to indicate where she would like him to be, that is, with his mother, and accordingly dead? Only the Queen of Hell could have such a villain for a son! Cf. such derogatory expressions in English as "devil's brood," "devil's spawn," "son of perdition," "son of a bitch."

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *DEVAS CORNISCAS*, *CIL*, I<sup>2</sup>, 814 = I<sup>2</sup>, 975.

<sup>2</sup> Audollent, p. 272.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Schulze, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

2. **USURS INIM MALAKS:** Bū. -orus et mollis, nom. sg., cf. μαλακός; he considered and rejected the possibility of the acc. pl. Bréal, Con. uxores et . . . ; Bg. vPl. Bk. osores et malevolos; H. miser et malacus; De. Pa. mulieres et liberos. The one word is to be equated with Latin osor or with uxor; the other with malus extended by a suffix, or with the Greek given above. I incline to Bugge's interpretation.

3. **NISTRUS**, for **NESTRUS:** Bū. Pa. propiores, whence De. vPl. Bk. propinquos; Bg. Con. nostros; H. nutans. Bücheler is certainly right in taking it as a comparative to the superlative *nessimo*, *proximus*, which motivates the next words syntactically.

2. **ANTKADUM:** Bg. Con. vPl. ante cadere; De. ut cadant; Pa. antea mactari; Bk. occidionem; Bū. makes no attempt at interpretation, and H. divides **ANIKAD UM**, contingat; igitur. Nearly all take it as infinitive of purpose; the prefix may or may not be a separate word, but in either instance conveys the idea zur Vergeltung, as Deecke pointed out.

2. **DAMIAd:** the restorations are very various, though most of them rest on the root seen in Greek δαμα-, which, as Deecke noted, was used häufig vom Tode; the same root is in Latin domare. I take the word as an ablative of means or of manner, with an Oscan equivalent of Latin pessimus as an adjunct, though this word is not actually found in the Italic dialects.

3. **IDIK:** forms of this pronoun in Oscan denote "the aforesaid," except when followed immediately by an explanatory relative clause. I therefore take it, with Bū. and others, but against Bg. and H., to refer to the idea expressed in the preceding.

3. **PREBAIAMPU\*ULUM:** so on the tablet, without signs of word-division; Bū., followed by H. De. Con., **PREBAIAM PUkULUM**; Bg., followed by vPl. Bk., **PREBAI AMPUIULUM**; Pa. **PREBAIAM PUz ULUM**, oblationes ut sepulcrorum. The choice is between Bücheler's text and Bugge's. The latter takes the second word as cognate to Latin anculus, Greek ἀμφίπολος, with a diminutive suffix, and translates by ministrum, which is accepted by von Planta and by Buck; but in **PREBAI** he finds a perfect participle passive, agreeing with **VIBIAI**, and meaning spoliatae, a quite untenable view. One would rather take it as a cognomen of Vibia, and, after von Planta, I, 348, 485, equate it with Greek πρέσβυς; but Vibia

is provided with another name in 10, and cognomina are rare in Oscan. Women probably did not have them at all. Could **PREBAI** be an adverb "at once"? Yet this implies that the **E** stands, in defiance of Oscan phonetics, for the diphthong *ai*, and must be regretfully abandoned.

Bücheler, dividing **PREBAIAM PUKULUM**, thought of associating **PREBAIAM** with the neuter plural *prebaia* (Gloss of Cyrillus; to which Deecke added *praebia remedia* from Paul Fest. 235 M., cf. 234; cf., also, Varro *LL.* vii. 107), whence he got the meaning "amulet," and suggested **VIBIAI PREBAIAM**, [but] protection to Vibia," to avert any evil reaction from the preceding curse, as in *Προσοδίου δὲ δῶτα* of a Cnidian tablet (Audollent, p. 12). Yet the brevity of the following sentence, reduced to two words, is against this. Bücheler suggested now that **PUKULUM** might be the same word as in the phrase **VALAIMAS PUKLUM**, where its enclisis prevented anaptyxis (Bü. reverses the process and says that the enclisis caused syncope); the two words might mean "first-born child." Huschke and Deecke, building on this text, proposed "magic cup." But any association with *praebia* or with "first-born" equates Oscan **E** with a diphthong, possible only by borrowing from a monophthongizing dialect. I suggest that **PREBAIAM** is a proper name, the feminine to a gentilicium with the ending shown in Oscan **MARAHIS**, Latin *Annaea*, *Poppaea*, etc.

The theft must have been one of some consequence, to be the basis for such a curse. Huschke and Deecke think of a magic cup which, to increase its importance, they conjectured to belong to a temple; the others assume the theft of a slave. I have returned to a suggestion of the first editor. The child, be it noted, does not bear Vibia's name, but the feminine gentilicium of (presumably) its father. As for the form **PUKULUM**, the apparent anaptyxis may be explained as already stated, or may be a mere dittography, since **U** and **L** in the Oscan alphabet were often indistinguishable when carelessly written, as in this tablet.

3. **DADA**D: as Oscan \**dād* is the equivalent of Latin *dē*, this verb is the equivalent of *dēdere* rather than of *reddere*, though the ultimate meaning is the same.

4. **ULAS**: Bü. De. Pa. Con. *sepulcri*, H. *Orci*; Bg. vPl. Bk. *illius*, which seems to me far better.



4. **SVAI NEIP DADID**: unlike all previous editors, I have ended the sentence after this clause; thus the preceding sentence is motivated. Buck begins a sentence with this clause, and, with Danielsson, does not end it after **LAMATIR**; Huschke begins his sentence likewise, but makes **LAMATIR** a participle, belonging in the clause; all others end the sentence after **LAMATIR**. Von Planta, in closing the sentence here, was influenced by his desire to find plurals in the verbs in **-ATAR** in 5, which requires a change of subject from the singular in **LAMATIR**.

4. **LAMATIR**: "let him be sold into slavery," according to Bū. Bg. De. Pa. vPl. Con.; *obstinatus*, H.; *caedatur*, Dan. Bk. (cf. page 238 n.), whose view I adopt.

4. **DUNTEis**: Bū. *mortui*, cf. *δύντος*; Bg. Pa. vPl. *devoti*, as though *\*dōnītī*; H. *potentiae*, cf. *δύναμις*; De. *dentis*, cf. *ὀδόντος*; Dan. **DENTE**s, *dentibus*. Accepting Bugge's meaning, I think that instead of its being equivalent to *\*doniti*, which requires a shift in the formation, the word might be the regular development of (the equivalent of Latin) *dōmītī*, the root of which is perhaps to be recognized in **DAMIAd** 2 and is further utilized by me for the conjectural **du-matir** at the end of this line.

5. **KAISPATAR**: Bū. *caedatur*; Bg. *caespitibus tegitor*; H. *febrī conficitor*; De. *caesus sit*; Pa. *virgis caedatur*; vPl. *caespitantor*; Bk. *glebis tundatur*. **KRUSTATAR**: Bū. Pa. Bk. *cruentetur*; Bg. *glebis tegitor*; H. *frigore conficitor*; De. *contritus sit*; vPl. *cruentantor*.

In these two difficult verbs, I incline to find, with Bugge, denominatives to *\*kaispā* and *\*krustā*. Bugge makes the former an equivalent of Latin *caespes*, comparing the doublets *palma* and *palmes*; *\*kaispaum* means "to cover with sods," even as *humare* means "to cover with earth." *\*Krustaum* I take, almost like Bugge, as a direct equivalent of Latin *crustare*, "to cover with a layer or crust," whence it might mean "to incase in earth, to bury." The four verbs of the sentence then form a logical succession: "that he be flogged, be killed, be covered with sods, be buried."

As to the form, whose difficulty lies in the **A** of the final syllable, I wish to offer an explanation which to some extent is different from those heretofore set forth. The second and third persons singular of the future imperative of the first conjugation ended in *-ā-tōd*; the



second singular of the present imperative ended in *-ā*. The *r*-passives of the two would be, respectively, *-ālōr* and *-ār*; and the two might have been contaminated to *-ālār*, especially as the *-ār* second person imperative was ambiguous with the third person indicative passive of the type wherein *r* replaces the final *t* or *d* of the active. But specimens of all these forms are either extremely rare or non-occurrent in the extant remains of the Italic dialects.

5. **SVAI NEIP**: all previous editors have taken this with the following. I take it with the preceding, for reasons already given; it repeats the **SVAI NEIP DADID** of line 4, which is similarly attached to the end of its sentence.

5. **AVT**: all previous editors take as meaning *aut*, except Deecke, who interprets *ast*. The word is found in the Cippus Abellanus, the Tabula Bantina, two of the *jovila*-inscriptions, and in the inscription of Bovianum, in all of which it means *at*, *autem*, while **AUTI** in the Tabula Bantina means *aut*. Only in the present inscription is **AVT** taken to mean *aut*. Though the material is not overabundant, still it is possible that **AVT** is here also to be taken as *at*, *autem*, except where we have it doubled as a correlative, in line 12, and in 5-6, in which the prior occurrence is a restoration. This view I adopt.

5. **SVAI**: virtually like German *wenn*, combining the idea of condition and that of future time.

5. **TIUM**: nom. sg. according to all but Bugge, who makes it acc. sg.

5. **FIFIKUS**: Bū. Bg. Pa. vPl. Bk. *decreveris*; H. *defixeris*; De. Con. *fixeris*. While the word may denote the magical act of the *defixio*, it is more reasonable that it indicates the assent of Ceres to the prayer and her conversion of the entreaty into a reality.

5. **PUST EISuk**: referring to the idea of the preceding clause.

5. **kahad**: vPl. was the first to recognize that this form was a subjunctive rather than an indicative; the Latin version is, of course, to be justified as expressing a generalized condition. Its meaning is variously rendered, since it has two uses in this inscription: *capere* (Bū. De. Pa. vPl. Con. Bk.), *incohare* (Bg. Pa.), *parare* (Bg.), *desiderare* (H.), *concupere* (De.), *suscipere* (Con.), *incipere* (Bk.); *parare* seems to me to fit both uses most acceptably.

6. **PUNUM**: Bréal recognized that the dots in **PUN:UM** were

an error, and that **UM** was not a separate word, though Bū. and De. rendered it *votum*, and H. rendered it *igitur*. Bréal recognized the generalizing **-um**, Bg. and Con. render *umquam*, Pa. vPl. Bk. render it "whenever" (with different Latin words). The last view I adopt.

7. **NIP . . . NIP**: the relation of this negative to the **NEIP** of lines 4, 5, 6, is puzzling. It is found only in this line and in the next; and in both lines it is repeated, showing use as a correlative. This may be the explanation, for **NEIP** is not used either here or elsewhere as a correlative. On the other hand, **NEP** is found in correlative use regularly, and that problem of differentiation still remains.

7. **AISUSIS**: I take this, with Bū. (and Bk.; vPl. *dis* or *sacrificiis*; Con. dat. or abl. pl.) as ablative, with modifying adjectives. Bg. Pa. *sacrificia*, H. *hostiae* (*oblatae*), De. **AISUS IS**, *sacrificia eius*, all as subject of **PUTIANS**.

7. **UFTEIS**: with Bg. *optati* or the like, depending on **PIDUM**; so vPl. Bk.; and virtually H. *voti*. De. Pa. *preces*, nom.; Con. gen. sg. of ptc. or acc. pl. of *i*-stem, *spes*, *vota*.

7. **PAI**: almost certainly the accusative with the passive **KARANTER**, like the similar usage with Latin *vescor pascor depascor*, rather than governed by a preposition at the end of the preceding line (mentioned as alternative possibility by Bū. and accepted by H.), since the proper substitute is an ablative of means, as with those Latin verbs.

9. **SULUH**: Bū. H. vPl. *denique*, but better Bg. De. Pa. Bk. *omnino*; Con. *penitus*.

9. **TURUMIAD**: variously rendered into Latin, though the sense is evident. There is only the question whether it should be associated with *torquere* and *tormentum*, as Bugge suggested, or with *torpescere*, an alternative suggestion of von Planta (I, 384 n.). The former view is more in keeping with the preceding context, which this verb sums up.

10. **VIBIIAI AKVIIAI**: the latter of these names seems to be a gentilicium, equal to Latin *Acuvia*,<sup>1</sup> though only Deecke so translates it; Conway refers to the Campanian gens *Aquvia* (II, 596; I, 163). All others give "Aquia" as their Latin translation, though I can find no occurrence of this name. **VIBIIAI**, despite the doubled I, must be a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. vPl. I, 347; Schulze, *op. cit.*, pp. 68, 550.

praenomen, corresponding to the masculine **VIBIS** found in a number of Oscan inscriptions.

11. **HUNTRUS**: though Bū. perceived the meaning, it remained for Bg. to separate the words properly, and for De. to connect the form and the meaning. But even von Planta's conjecture (II, 629 n.) on the form is rather unsatisfactory, for an original form in *-ō* is non-existent in Italic, and *-ōd* with *s* attached as in Latin *abs* would give \***huntruz**. Possibly the accusative plural, meaning *ad inferos* (as Bg. interpreted the word), developed to a merely adverbial and prepositional function; **TERAS** is then a genitive singular, not an accusative plural. The same explanation would hold for **SUPRus** in line 10.

12. **AVT KERI . . . . AVT . . . . LEGINEI**: dative of agent with the following verb, unless the alternative restoration of line 11, mentioned above, is to be credited. The agent construction happens not to occur in the extant remains of the Italic dialects, so that there is no valid argument against the possibility that it was expressed by the dative, even as it was in Latin with the gerundive and often with the perfect participle. Here, my restoration includes a participle, **TUSz**.

12. **TRUTAS**: it is more likely that this word means "fourth," as Bg. and Bk. take it, than that it means "definite, fixed," as Bū. thought; vPl. and Con. are non-committal as between these views, and others are erratic or offer no interpretation.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### ROMAN DINNER-GARMENTS

In Volume XLIX of the *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* (pp. 131 ff.), Dr. Ethel H. Brewster published an admirable study<sup>1</sup> of the *synthesis* in which after a careful exposition of previous theories, she comes to conclusions of her own, the gist of which is that it was a costume which combined into a single robe a basic element of the tunic variety and a small mantle or *palliolum* which was attached to the shirt, either to serve a utilitarian purpose or merely to form, in some cases, a bit of conventional trimming.

In a discussion of clothing, if in nothing else, a woman should have the last word, and after Dr. Brewster has shown so much scholarship and feminine ingenuity in designing *syntheses* for banquets and for outdoor use at the Saturnalia, a mere man naturally hesitates to revert to the problem. But I am convinced that in spite of multitudinous attempts, nobody of either sex has yet fully solved it, and I have furthermore the excellent masculine precedent of Poirer, Worth, and the rest to encourage me to pick up needle and scissors for a little dressmaking of my own.

In the first place, we may fully subscribe to the argument that *synthesis* and *cenatorium* are synonymous terms. Moreover, from the etymology of the Greek word and from its meaning in other connections than in that of dress we may reasonably conclude that *synthesis* is here, too, employed of two<sup>2</sup> or more things that are used together. For instance, the ancients would have termed a dozen identical "bread-and-butter plates" a *synthesis*,<sup>3</sup> so, too, a woman's "costume suit" in contradistinction to what is called an "odd waist and skirt." But neither in the case of dishes, bowls, cups, and the like would the pieces have to fit into one another, nor in the case of garments would they have to be attached to one another by sewing. In other words, we are not to think of a "nest of Chinese cups" nor of a "union-suit" as modern parallels, but merely of objects that belong together through similarity in appearance.

<sup>1</sup> The reader may be referred to her article for details that are not necessary to my argument and are omitted in the interest of brevity.

<sup>2</sup> In Martial xiv. 141. 2 the use of the plural *hos cultus* of the *synthesis* may be significant. Similarly, we commonly find the neuter plural *cenatoria*. In *vestis cenatoria*, the noun is collective, meaning "clothing," not "garment." In Petronius 30, the dinner-clothes, *vestimenta cubitoria* (*accubitoria* according to the emendation of Lipsius), are again a plurality. Any theory that makes *synthesis* a tunic (or one of a set of tunics), or a mantle, or, in fact, any single garment, seems to me quite untenable.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Martial iv. 46. 15.

If now we take the Roman *synthesis* to mean a two-piece suit consisting of a tunic and of a shoulder-garment, which are constituted a suit by being fabricated of cloth of the same color and normally of a bright and cheery one, purple, leek-green, or the like, all difficulties will, I think, disappear.

The trouble hitherto has been that some important references have been either overlooked or conveniently ignored, others have been inaccurately interpreted, while no theory yet devised has been so applied as to harmonize even all the passages that have been brought into the discussion. Scholars have thought it necessary to discuss the possible size and shape of the *synthesis* with reference to its use by one reclining on a dinner-couch, where ordinary street-garb would be awkward to manipulate, or rather, let us say, to knee and to foot, but they have neglected what seems to me an equally important consideration, the warmth of the costume as adapted to indoor or outdoor use or to the season when it was worn. The heat of an Italian summer would require a *synthesis* to consist of a tunic and mantle of the lightest of fabrics. At that time of year a fop like Zoilus could pretend perspiration as his excuse for flaunting in succession eleven different suits in the course of a meal during which the poverty of Martial would have to keep him cool in the only *synthesis* he possessed.<sup>1</sup> Obviously, too, the white *cenatorium*<sup>2</sup> that the Arval brethren wore at their dinners, replacing the everyday tunic and cumbersome *praetexta* which the preceding ceremonies of worship required, could not have been of the weight of a saturnalian *synthesis*; for the season was the second half of May when the climate of Rome will sweat out even "original sin." On the other hand, in December when the tramontana blows, the holiday season might require a citizen to doff his sober *toga*, but surely the *synthesis* with which he replaced his usual winter clothing would be as warm as it was gay. In other words, the *indumentum* or *indutus* part of his Saturnalian suit could be a more voluminous or lengthy woolen tunic, the *amictus* portion something more than a summer mantle, even when worn at table, and surely when worn out of doors.

And now, at last, I hope, we can understand the full significance of those references to the *laena*<sup>3</sup> and the *abolla*<sup>4</sup> used as dinner-garments, passages left unexplained by those who have regarded the *synthesis* as primarily a shirt or a shirt with a mantle-top. The *abolla cenatoria* and the *laena cenatoria* simply constituted the outer element or cloak of a two-piece *synthesis* and were chosen for their superior warmth.

Furthermore, we can now explain plausibly those parallel passages in

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, v. 79.

<sup>2</sup> Henzen, *Acta Fr. Arv.*, pp. cciii and ccxxv; cf. p. cxxxi.

<sup>3</sup> Such seems to be the hyacinthine mantle of Persius i. 32.

<sup>4</sup> *CIL*, VIII, 4508: *Abolla cenatoria* leads to the emendation of Gloss. Pap. *abolla*: *genus togae, vestis cenatoria* [Ms *senatoria*] *duplex amictus*.

Suetonius<sup>1</sup> and Dio Cassius<sup>2</sup> which picture the outrageous costume of Nero. The former historian does not say, as previous students of the *synthesis* have implied, that the emperor wore that garment; he says that Nero wore only the under half of it. In other words, he had put on over his head (*indutus*) a very gay shirt which belonged to a dinner-suit, *synthesinam*, i.e., *tunicam*,<sup>3</sup> as the etymology of the perfect passive participle shows, and then, instead of the upper garment that propriety required, he had encircled his neck with some sort of linen handkerchief, a *sudarium*, such as might better be used to mop a sweaty brow. A flowery tunic of contracted size, the *χιτώνιον ἄνθρωπον* of Dio Cassius, and a *συνδόνιον* around his bull-neck must have made of him anything but an imperial figure to receive senators of the Roman Empire.

When *synthesis* is understood to be a suit of two like-colored garments, the one the tunic, the other, whatever outer garments suited comfort and convenience,<sup>4</sup> the legacy of Sempronia Pia to which the Digest<sup>5</sup> refers is quite comprehensible. She is to receive three tunics and some small mantles. But the question is raised whether she shall have free choice of any in the entire wardrobe or must keep together sets of garments that belong together. The decision is that if there are odd garments, i.e., shirts and mantles that do not form a *synthesis* or suit, she can select freely from them. The alternative is to take them by suits, just as they were constituted to be worn together, or to receive their equivalent in money. Nowhere is there any evidence that compels us to think of the shirt and the shoulder-garments as in any way attached to one another.<sup>6</sup> The only combination, known to me, that might suggest a sewing together of a shirt and mantle is the so-called *tunico-pallium*, in other words, is a garment that, having a name of its own, is not the *synthesis*, and, in fact, is susceptible to quite a different description which does not concern me here.

WALTON BROOKS MCDANIEL

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

<sup>1</sup> Ner. 51: "Circa cultum habitumque adeo pudendus ut comam semper in gradus formatam peregrinatione Achaica etiam pone verticem summisserit ac plerumque *synthesinam* indutus ligato circum collum sudario prodierit in publicum sine cinctu et discalciatus."

<sup>2</sup> Dio Cassius lxxiii. 13. 3: τοὺς δὲ βουλευτὰς χιτώνιον τι ἐνδεδικώς ἄνθρωπον καὶ συνδόνιον περὶ τὸν ἀγκῶνα ἔχων, ἡσπασάτο.

<sup>3</sup> *tunicam*. A neglected passage is the quotation made by Nonius (Lindsay, p. 860) from the Quintus of Titinius, where the almost certain emendation *syntheticis* qualified *tunicis* and may conceivably refer to shirts that are worn with a mantle or cloak, thus constituting a suit.

<sup>4</sup> Naturally, the combinations for men and women would not be the same. Therefore, we have in the Digest xxxiv. 2. 33: "muliebribus cenatoriis."

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 38. 1: "Semproniae Piae . . . tunicas tres cum palliolis quae elegerit dari volo. Quaero an ex universa veste, id est an ex *synthesi*, tunicas singulas et palliola Sempronia eligere possit. Respondit, si essent tunicae singulares cum palliolis relictiae ex his dumtaxat eligi posse, quod si non est, heredem vel tunicas et palliola sed ex *synthesi*, praestaturam vel veram aestimationem earum."

<sup>6</sup> In *ibid.* 2. 381: The cum in *tunicas tres cum palliolis* means, of course, accompaniment, not attachment.

EMENDATION OF ARISTOTLE'S *METAPHYSICS* 1079 B 2-6

εἰ δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τοὺς κοινούς λόγους ἐφαρμόττειν θήσομεν τοῖς εἰδεῖν, οἷον ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸν κύκλον σχῆμα ἐπίπεδον καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου, τὸ δ' οὐ ἐστὶ προστεθήσεται, σκοπεῖν δὲ μὴ κενὸν ἢ τοῦτο παντελῶς.

For οὐ ἐστὶ both Platonic usage and Platonic thought require us to read οὐ ἔστι. What first arouses suspicion is the fact that there is nothing in Plato to which the criticism expressed by οὐ ἐστὶ could plausibly apply. Plato nowhere converts a definition of a concept, a class, a group of particulars into a definition of the idea by adding that it is a definition of the thing in question. Such a procedure would be senseless from the point of view either of Plato or of common sense. Professor Ross's note to his translation explains: "so that the definition of an ideal circle would be 'a plane figure whose circumference is at all points equidistant from the center and which is the Form of individual circles.'" It must be admitted that this is the explanation of Alexander who interprets τοῦτ' ἐστὶν παράδειγμα ὃν τῶν αἰσθητῶν. Syrianus puts it differently: προστεθείη δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ιδέας τὸ νοητὸν εἰ τύχοι. But he too apparently had our text. But no such definition can be found in Plato. In both Xenophon and Plato the quest for the definition is an endeavor to learn what the thing really is as the condition precedent of knowing anything further about it.<sup>1</sup>

The definition is the nearest approximation in human speech to that reality, and Plato calls the reality the idea. The terminology employed in the Socratic dialogues of search for the definition is so indistinguishable from the terminology of the Platonic idea that scholars are at a loss to say at what precise point the distinctive theory of ideas emerges.<sup>2</sup> The entire antithesis between a definition of concepts or particulars and a definition of the idea belongs not to Plato, but to the criticisms of Aristotle and the hairsplitting refinements of the Academy and of modern philologists. For Plato the definition is an attempt to ascertain the idea, to express it as nearly as may be in language. He has his formulas for suggesting further his belief in the metaphysical and poetical transcendence of the idea adumbrated by the definition.<sup>3</sup> But he never does this by adding that the definition is a definition of the thing in question. Of course it is a definition of the "thing" defined, and Plato, like everybody else, sometimes explicitly repeats that the definition proposed or found is the definition of the thing sought.<sup>4</sup> But this is never done in order

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 16. Plato *Charm.* 175 B. ἐφ' ὅτῳ ποτὲ τῶν ὄντων ὁ νομοθέτης τοῦτο τοῖνομα ἔθετο τὴν σοφροσύνην. *Laches* 190 B; *Meno* 71 A; *Hipp. Maior* 286 D; *Protag.* 361 E; *Rep.* 354 C, D; *Parmen.* 147 E: ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ τῇ φύσει. So he often uses πρᾶγμα or οὐσία for the reality behind the sought definition and the word defined. E.g., *Protag.* 349 C.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my *Unity of Plato's Thought*, p. 31.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the well-known passages, *Phaedrus* 247 C; 250 C, D; *Phaedo* 78, 79, 80; *Symp.* 210 E; 211 A-D; *Rep.* 514 B ff.; *Tim.* 28 A, B; 52 C.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Sophist* 268 D; *Theaet.* 147 C; yet even there he does not use the genitive!



to distinguish a definition of the idea from a definition of particulars. There are only one or two hints of such a distinction in Plato and they are not really relevant. In the criticism of the theory of ideas in the *Parmenides*, Parmenides (133) objects that relations obtaining in the world of things will not apply to relations between ideas and vice versa. But even there the distinction is not applied to the definition. On the contrary, in the final summing up of the difficulty (135 B, C) the doctrine of ideas is postulated as indispensable because without it there can be no definition of things at all or any dialectics of the kind portrayed in Xenophon and the minor dialogues.

There is no pertinency either in the well-known passage of the *Laws* (895 C) that distinguishes concerning *ἑκαστον* the name or word, the *λόγος* or definition and the essence (*οὐσία*) or reality (*ὄν*). That is a distinction of common sense which can be interpreted in terms either of Platonism or of ordinary conceptualism. Plato merely says that in all cases we may distinguish the name, convertible with the definition, the definition, and the "thing," entity, *πρᾶγμα*, *οὐσία*, *φύσις*, *ὄν*, whatever you choose to call it, that is defined. It does not suggest an opposition between a definition that applies to particulars and a definition that fits only the idea. That distinction, as I have said, is contrary both to Plato's thought and to his practice. The definition is the idea so far as the transcendent idea is expressible at all. And the only doubtful question, if it is doubtful, is the precise point at which the terminology of the definition identical with the terminology of the idea is to be taken as implying that the metaphysical theory of ideas is already there. In the *Laches* (192 A, D) when *ταχύτης* is defined, as an illustration of what is meant by a definition, Socrates does not turn the definition into an idea by adding that it is a definition of *ταχύτης*. He says, "if you should ask me what in all cases *ταχύτης* is I should say that this is *ταχύτης*," where the idiomatic use and emphasis of *εἶναι*, which prepares the way for Aristotle's technical uses of *εἶναι* for the pure concept, may be thought to imply the doctrine of ideas. But he does not add an *of* to the definition. He uses a form of the verb "to be," and this is his normal usage. In *Republic* 529 D where absolute and ideal swiftness is to be distinguished from concrete and materially embodied swiftness he merely uses *τὸ ὄν* and *ἡ οὐσα* and *ἀληθινῶς*. So in the familiar passages of the *Phaedo* we find *αὐτὸ τὸ ἴσον* (78 D) and *ἡ οὐσία ἧς λόγον δίδομεν τοῦ εἶναι*, which merely means the thing we define with the further implication that the thing is metaphysically a transcendent reality.

In short, one of the terms which Plato "adds," to the word rather than to the definition, to signify that it is to be taken in the ideal sense is *ὁ ἔστι*, and this is what we must restore in Aristotle.

Aristotle's criticism, then, is not as the interpreters say a new and unique point, but only a variation on a familiar objection. It is merely an illusion, he says, to suppose that you can make a transcendent reality out of a class name or concept by saying that it is eternal or unchanging or adding to it the

prefix αὐτό. Cf. *Mel.* 997 B 5 ἀποπον τὸ φάναι μὲν εἶναι τινος φύσει παρὰ τὰς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ταύτας δὲ τὰς αὐτὰς φάναι τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς πλὴν ὅτι τὰ μὲν διὰ τὰ δὲ φθαρτά. αὐτὸ γὰρ ἀνθρωπὸν φασιν εἶναι, etc. Cf. 1040 B 33 προστιθέντες τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ αὐτό. The present criticism, then, is not a new point, not elsewhere found in Aristotle. It is simply a variation on an oft-repeated objection. For προστιθέντες τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ αὐτό Aristotle writes here, using another equally Platonic expression, τὸ δ' ὃ ἔστι προστεθήσεται. The cacophony is no objection. Aristotle uses διὰ τὸ τὸ 341 A 30.

PAUL SHOREY

### THE SEXTARIOLUS

The possession of a sense of humor, or at least its unrestrained indulgence, is a dangerous thing for a philologist, or anyone else who at times wishes to be taken seriously. On the other hand, the lack of that quality, or the failure to take account of its existence in dealing with the utterances of ancient writers, sometimes leads one astray. These profound observations are suggested by Professor Frank's note on the *sextariolus* of Augustus,<sup>1</sup> in the course of his interesting and suggestive article, "On Augustus' References to Horace."

Augustus was a notorious joker, and many specimens of his wit and humor have been recorded by Suetonius, Macrobius, and others. The grave statement, then, that "it is difficult to comprehend how a *sextarius* could be used as a tablet on which to write poems" makes one rub one's eyes. One might almost as well say in connection with the emperor's well-known witicism, "*Aiacem suum in spongiam incubuisse*,"<sup>2</sup> that it is not easy to understand how a book could fall upon a sponge, and that for a man to do so would not be fatal; that therefore there must be concealed in *spongiam* the name of some otherwise unknown lethal weapon, probably a kind of sword.

As a matter of fact, it would not be difficult to write poems on a *sextarius* or on a *sextariolus*. Verses could readily be incised on a pot of metal or written with a brush on a cup of earthenware. Indeed, one of our modern wizards of the pen who write the Declaration of Independence on a dime could doubtless find room on a pint-pot for a good part of the first three books of Horace's *Odes*; it would not be much more difficult, one would think, than to write the same amount on a roll two inches high.

But, as has been suggested, that possibility has nothing to do with the question. The resemblance between a pint-pot and the rotund form of the bard of Venusia was quite enough for the fun-loving emperor, while the substitution of the meaning suggested by Professor Frank makes his jest as *frigidus et arcessitus* as one of Claudius'.

<sup>1</sup> *Classical Philology*, XX, 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Suet. Aug.* 85.

The unique diminutive, if one may be allowed to give one's imagination loose rein, may well have been suggested to Augustus—as well as the choice of that particular measure—by the fact that the *sextarius* was the limit of his indulgence in wine.<sup>1</sup> The diminutive would then be one of affectionate remembrance, “one of my dear little pint-pots.”

J. C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

### AESCHYLUS' PERSIAN TRILOGY

The question of the probable content of the trilogy which Aeschylus produced in 472 B.C. would hardly be worth discussing were it not for two reasons: von Christ adopts a view which seems to me wrong, and the consideration of the question brings to view one or two interesting points.

The plays which were produced along with the *Persians* were the *Phineus*, *Glaucus*, and *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*. The *Glaucus* was, to the best of our knowledge, the *Glaucus Potnieus*. The manuscript containing this added title is late; still, this is the best information we have, and should not be abandoned without a compelling reason. We should naturally suppose, then, that the first play of the trilogy dealt with Phineus' adventures with the Harpies, or some such matter, while the *Glaucus* dealt with the man-eating mares and their final destruction of their master.<sup>2</sup> Fragments 258 and 260 would seem to support this view in the case of the *Phineus*. What reason, then, has von Christ for stating that the *Phineus* dealt with the Persian march through Thrace?<sup>3</sup> Apparently, no reason except the belief that Aeschylus never wrote a split trilogy. Miss Spring<sup>4</sup> takes a milder view. Without depriving the *Phineus* of its natural content, she is content to suppose that the play contained certain oracles dealing with the Persian march. This would constitute a slender-enough connection between the plays; moreover, what need is there of supposing that such oracles were in the play? Simply that Darius refers to certain oracles<sup>5</sup> dealing with the Persian defeat at Salamis; therefore, thinks Miss Spring, he must be referring to something in the *Phineus*. The true explanation is much simpler; Darius is merely a resurrected mortal, with all a mortal's limitations on his knowledge; he is unaware of the cause which led Atossa to summon him; how, then, shall he know what is to happen in the future—he who had to be told what had happened on earth in the past? Why, by the same method that any mortal might learn of the future—by an oracle; and he is sure of the truth of the oracle—a sureness often denied to

<sup>1</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 77.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Nauck, *Fragg.*, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Von Christ, *Gesch. d. Griech. Litt.*, I, 29.

<sup>4</sup> “A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy,” *Harvard Studies*, XXVIII (1917), 159.

<sup>5</sup> *Persians* ii. 739–40; for Darius' limitations, cf. ii. 693, 705–6.

mortals—because part of the prophecy has come true. Had Darius been a more sophisticated ghost, he might have dispensed with oracles because of his supernatural powers; as it is, he has need of oracles, but no need of previous reference to them. So much for the *Phineus*.

On the *Glaucus* there is more light. If, as we have reason to believe, this is the *Glaucus Potnieus*, how could Glaucus, son of Sisyphus,<sup>1</sup> "describe the battle [of Plataea] as he saw it," as Miss Spring says? He had been torn by his mares long before the Persian wars. The fragments surely point to the story of the mares, not to a battle. "Chariot on chariot lay, dead piled on dead"<sup>2</sup>—were there chariots at Plataea? But in a chariot-race (and what more natural for a horse-breeder than chariot-racing?) this tragic scene was not uncommon. "A contest waits not for men left behind"—again a contest, but not necessarily a battle.<sup>3</sup> "They tore like wolves, as when two wolves do bear a fawn by the shoulder-joints"—this is surely much more to the point as a description of the mares than of the fighters, however desperate they may have been, at Plataea.<sup>4</sup> Even if this play were the *Glaucus Pontios*, is there any reason for associating the play with Plataea, except for a lone reference to Euboea in the fragments?<sup>5</sup> It would be a strange play the interest of which centered, not in the title-character, but in a narration by him, which was by no means a special story peculiarly appropriate to the narrator. Another point—as Miss Spring notes, Darius' prophecies of Plataea are given with "meticulous detail." Now prophecies referring to a following play need not be explicit—they should not be, in fact, in order not to diminish the suspense.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, when we meet a detailed prophecy, the natural inference is that this prophecy is given once for all, and its explicitness is due to the necessity of telling the whole story then and there. So the prophecy of Darius is probably independent of the *Glaucus*, just as his oracles are probably independent of the *Phineus*; no living Persian could reasonably be supposed to know these oracles, hence the dead is evoked to insert by narrative prophecy the indispensable corollary to Salamis, which otherwise could hardly be included in the play.

A final point: If the *Phineus*, *Persians*, *Glaucus*, were a trilogy, what of the *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*? In all the cases of which we know definitely, Aeschylus wrote tetralogies, that is, the satyr-play belongs in the series, *Lycurgus* in the *Lycurgeia*, *Proteus* in the *Oresteia*, *Sphinx* in the *Theban* series. We might trace two other such combinations with reasonable certainty—that of the *Amymone* with the Danaid trilogy, and of the *Circe* with the

<sup>1</sup> Probus on Verg. *Georg.* iii. 267.

<sup>2</sup> *Glaucus Potnieus*, fr. 38 (Murray's translation).

<sup>3</sup> *Glaucus Potnieus*, fr. 37.

<sup>4</sup> *Glaucus Potnieus*, fr. 39.

<sup>5</sup> *Glaucus Pontios*, fr. 30.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Agamemnon* i. 1280 ff., 1318–19.

*Psychagogoi*, *Penelope*, *Ostologoi*, to form an Odysseus tetralogy. But surely the *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* has nothing to do with the history of Persia—we can hardly suppose that it contained the aition of Zoroastrian fire-worship! If, then, Aeschylus wrote a split tetralogy, we surely have the right to assume that he might further split the trilogy, and this is the conclusion to which all the evidence, such as it is, points.

ALFRED CARY SCHLESINGER

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS.

#### HORACE'S *INTEGER VITAE*

Fifteen years ago Professors Hendrickson and Shorey engaged in a friendly controversy over the meaning of this famous ode. Hendrickson contended for a serious lyric expression of the poet's feeling, a love-song of closely knit sequence, in which *integer vitae* and *scelerisque purus*, whatever their universal ethical significance, were taken from the *sermo amatorius* and connoted the faithful lover. Shorey, reluctantly drawn into breaking a butterfly on a wheel, found the full solemn phrase *integer vitae* broadly ethical in force, resting his argument on his own *Sprachgefühl*, and placed the ode among the *vers de société* of solemn thought that plunges into laughter.<sup>1</sup>

Without wishing to renew or settle the controversy, may I call attention to five epigrams in the Greek anthology<sup>2</sup> which seem to me to have some bearing on the question and which are not mentioned by these gentlemen or by the commentators on the ode? These epigrams are evidently a part of Meleager's anthology and were written, therefore, before the time of Horace. All of them describe the miraculous escape of religious devotees from lions. In the first four, priests of Cybele are suddenly confronted by the beast but by beating their drums drive the animal away. The poems differ in their explanation of the result. *AP.* vi. 217, ascribed to Simonides, represents the lion as unable to bear the sacred boom of Cybele and as dreading the half-girlish servant of the goddess. In Alcaeus' epigram (vi. 218) the lion, on hearing the tambour, is itself filled with divine frenzy. Antipater (vi. 219) rationalizes: The lion, hearing the unaccustomed hollow boom of the bull's hide, was afraid and took to flight. Similarly, in Dioscorides (vi. 220) the beast is unable to bear the deep note in his ears, and the devotee ultimately dedicates the noisy instrument (*λαδύνημα*), as the cause of the lion's flight, to Rhea Cybele. Yet the epigrams of Simonides(?) and Alcaeus evidently contain the original thought. It is not the mere noise of the instrument but the lion's recognition of the divine presence that insures the safety of the devotee. And this thought is the basis of the fifth epigram, by Leonidas (vi. 221), in which the safe escape is experienced, not by devotees of Cybele, but by simple goatherds in the midst of a storm, who in the act of praying to Zeus Savior for their own personal

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Class. Jour.*, V [1909-10], 250 ff., 317 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *AP.* vi. 217-21

safety in the storm are saved also from the lion. Here, piety, and an observance of simpler religious ritual than the orgiastic revel of the priests of Cybele win the charity of the beast.

This succession of epigrams should indicate the prevalence of the theme as a stock topic, at least of anecdotal votive epigram, if not of other literature, before Horace. The general influence of Hellenistic epigram upon the spirit and form of Horace's *Odes* has already been profusely illustrated by Reitzenstein.<sup>1</sup> It would be absurd to press the point of any immediate relation of the *Integer Vitae* to these epigrams, and particularly to indulge in misdirected ingenuity by noting *λαλᾶγμα* of *AP.* vi. 220. 15 in connection with the name of Horace's heroine, or by observing minute likenesses between the description of the lions and Horace's account of the wolf. But the profoundly religious spirit of these five epigrams may add strength to Professor Shorey's *Sprachgefühl*.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

#### PROMETHEUS AND TITYOS

That myths may often be chronologically stratified, not merely by analysis of obvious borrowings, but also from the evidence of other purely incidental criteria, is, of course, a commonplace, and I here desire to call attention to such a stratification in the stories of the punishments of Prometheus and Tityos, each tortured by the gnawing of his liver by a bird (or birds). In his article on Prometheus in Roscher's *Lexikon* (3042-43) Bapp remarks: *Dass die Leber der leidende Teil ist, erklärt sich wohl aus Anlehnung an die Tityossage, denn dies Organ galt vorzüglich als Sitz sinnlicher Begier*. Since the punishment of Tityos appears as early as the *Odyssey* (xi, 576 ff.) while that of Prometheus is not mentioned by Homer (though found in Hesiod *Theog.* 521 ff.), it might seem easy to accept this view of the priority of the Tityos myth. Most scholars agree that the punishment of Tityos is made poetically appropriate to his offense, as commonly in the tortures in Dante's *Inferno*, and that, his sin having been one of passion, the organ punished is that in which carnal passion was supposed to reside, namely, the liver. But Prometheus was surely not punished for any such passion, and the transference to him of a penalty suitable to Tityos would seem highly inappropriate. Just here early psychology may come to our aid. That the liver was at a very early period considered not merely as the seat of passion but also as that of the soul—including the more intellectual functions of the soul—we have not a little evidence.<sup>2</sup> When the intelligence migrated from the liver to the diaphragm (as in Homer), the heart (as through much of classical antiquity), and finally to the brain (according

<sup>1</sup> *N. Jahrb. für d. kl. Alt.*, XXI (1908), 81 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my edition of Cicero, *De Divinatione*, p. 95; also Pacuv. ap. Cic. *de Div.* i. 131.



to Alcmaeon of Croton and later scientists), it left at each remove an emotional residuum in the organs which it had deserted, especially in the liver and the heart. To cite illustrations of this is hardly necessary; Horace's *meum iecur urere bilis*<sup>1</sup> and our own popular uses of "heart," "hard-hearted," etc., may serve as types.

Now the crime of Prometheus lay in the misuse of that intelligence to which his very name bears witness, and the story of the torture of his liver must, I believe, have arisen at an epoch when that organ was the seat of intelligence. The Tityos story, on the other hand, would have meant nothing at a time when the liver symbolized intelligence but everything at an age when it was held to be the seat of passion. Hence the Prometheus myth should be dated as the earlier and the judgment of Bapp should be reversed. What Silius meant (xiii. 839 ff.) by describing the *praecordia* of Tarpeia as similarly pecked by a bird I am not prepared to say, both because of the varied meanings which *praecordia* may have and because of the possibility of a mingling in his highly imitative work of contemporaneous and traditional psychology, but for the priority of the Prometheus myth over that of Tityos the case seems reasonably clear.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

AMHERST COLLEGE

#### ARIADNE AND HIGH MASS: CATULLUS 64. 104

Ariadne's solicitude for Theseus is not without its effect before the eyes of the gods; her ritual, furthermore, is correct in detail; the results prove this. There could be no shadow of difficulty with the Verona reading: "*tacito succendit vota libello*" and its thought, Friedrich to the contrary notwithstanding,<sup>2</sup> even if there were no approximate parallel known. Ariadne's prayer is kindled like incense, and like its smoke ascends to the divine presence. In addition, however, to the citations from Statius and Dio Cassius given by Ellis,<sup>3</sup> and in addition to a similar thought in Ovid *Met.* vi. 164, "*turaque dant sanctis et verba precantia flammis*," there is an ancient yet ever modern parallel kept alive by at least weekly repetition in nearly every Catholic parish of any considerable size; but through the force of circumstance this is all but unknown to the laity at large—even the Catholic laity.

At High Mass, incense is used at four distinct points in the service: at the introit, gospel, oblation, and elevation. At the third of these, the oblation,

<sup>1</sup> Sat. i. 9. 66.

<sup>2</sup> "*OG haben 'succendit.' Aber 'vota succendere' ist ebenso unerhört und unerklärbar wie 'vota succipere.'*" He ineptly emends to *succipit*, *Catulli Veronensis Liber erklärt* von Gustav Friedrich (Leipzig, 1908), p. 348).

<sup>3</sup> Statius *Theb.* xi. 236: "*vota incepta tamen libataque tura ferebat*"; Dio 41. 45: *λιβανωτὸν λαβὼν καὶ προσευξάμενος ῥίπτει αὐτὸν τὴν εὐχὴν φέροντα* (Robinson Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus*, Oxford, 1899).



the celebrant, receiving the censer at the hands of the deacon or thurifer, censes the oblata and then proceeds to cense the altar, first to the ecclesiastical south (right) then to the north (left), saying meanwhile: "*Dirigatur, Domine, oratio mea sicut incensum in conspectu tuo*, etc." (Ps. 140: 2 [Vulgate]). This is said in a tone audible only to himself—*voce secreta*, the lowest of the three degrees of volume of tone used by the celebrant, the loudest being *vox sonora*, audible throughout the church building; the intermediate is *vox submissa* or *vox media*, heard by the celebrant's immediate attendants but not in the nave; the *vox secreta* cannot be heard even by one standing at his elbow.<sup>1</sup> In those parishes of the Anglican Communion where incense is used, the procedure is identical save that the silent petition is in English: "Let my prayer be set forth in thy sight as the incense, etc." (Ps. 141: 2 [Book of Common Prayer]). The metaphor of Catullus is far subtler and more compact than is the simile of the psalm, but the likeness between his four words and this modern counterpart is striking, even to the "*tacito . . . libello*" and the rubric *voce secreta*.

CLAYTON M. HALL

SMITH COLLEGE

#### ON ALDUS' USE OF P

Doubtless the Parisinus,<sup>2</sup> now lost, contained the purest text of Pliny's *Letters* available to Aldus. But the faithfulness with which that editor followed P is a matter of dispute. H. Keil<sup>3</sup> and especially Professor E. T. Merrill<sup>4</sup> do not believe that Aldus followed his venerable codex with marked consistency. Professor E. K. Rand,<sup>5</sup> however, has come to the rescue of Aldus' moral and editorial integrity. I should like to give a brief, summarizing statement of Professor Rand's view, but, since I cannot do this in a coherent, unified sentence, owing to the fact that his utterances do not at all times seem to be characterized by precise harmony *inter se*, I shall take the liberty of repeating some of the pertinent remarks verbatim.

Morgan Fragment, page 43: ". . . he [Aldus] treated his ancient witness with respect, and abandoned it only when confronted with what seemed its obvious mistakes."

<sup>1</sup> Adrian Fortescue, *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described* (London, 1920). p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> For a brief description see p. XI of the *Praefatio* of Professor E. T. Merrill's critical edition, Teubner, 1922.

<sup>3</sup> *Praefatio*, p. xxxvii. Teubner edition, 1870.

<sup>4</sup> *Class. Phil.*, XIV (1919), 29-34.

<sup>5</sup> *A Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger* (edited by E. A. Lowe and E. K. Rand). Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1922; *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXXIV, 79 ff.

Morgan Fragment, page 65: "I admit that Aldus resorted throughout the text of the *Letters*—in some cases unhappily—to the customary editorial privilege of emendation."

*Harvard Studies*, page 131: "I will not deny that in cases of difficulty Aldus may have examined many texts, printed and manuscript, to find a satisfactory reading."

*Ibid.*, page 133: "... despite Mr. Merrill's dictum that the readings of P cannot be recovered from Aldus's edition [Teubner edition, p. xiii], it is tolerably certain that they can."

It is my opinion that Aldus departed from satisfactory P-readings far more often than Professor Rand will ordinarily admit, and that we cannot be at all certain in any given case that an Aldine reading, especially when it fails to agree with BF, represents the text of P. Every one of the following readings, rejected by Keil and Merrill, and disagreeing with the ten-book and nine-book tradition, is found in *p* and *a* and sometimes in one or more of the inferior eight-book manuscripts (page and line in this paper are given according to Professor E. T. Merrill's critical edition, Teubner, 1922):

17.13 nullas mihi *pa*

24.14 Syllani *xpa*. [By comparison with 24.20 it may be observed that Aldus is so inconsistent as to spell this name in two different ways within the narrow compass of six lines]

33.4 latioribus *mouxpa*

42.28 eae quibus *opa*

72.4 Vitellii *oxpa*

86.14 ideoque *pa*

90.7 rettulerim remitterem *pa*

92.1 sequenti die *oupa*

96.19 idem et consulatum *pa*

Some of the foregoing readings might lead to the suspicion that a corrected and supplemented copy of the *editio princeps* served as Aldus' copy for the printer. From casual observation I should judge that it cannot be determined from what early edition the Aldine text of 1508 was set up, yet I have in mind to make this point a matter of special study. I do not think it justifiable, however, to assume solely on the ground of probability, as Professor Rand<sup>1</sup> has done, that one of the *s* editions (Laetus, Beroaldus, Catanaeus) served as the printer's copy of the 1508 Aldine Pliny.

There are other readings, not found in the text of Teubner's critical editions of 1870 and 1922 and not supported by any known MS, which seem to me to be unnecessary departures from P by Aldus in favor of the *s* editions.

<sup>1</sup> *Harvard Studies*, XXXIV, 127: "In making special mention of the *recent* editions, I infer, I hope correctly, that Mr. Merrill also agrees with me in ruling out two faulty editions that had appeared over thirty years before, the *princeps* (*p*) of 1471 and the Roman edition (*r*) of 1474. It is certainly more probable that Aldus took as his basic edition . . . one of the later editions, those called *s* by Keil, . . ."

If my surmise is correct, then it is obvious among other matters that the words *Graeca correctae* of the Aldine Preface are in need of some modification. Furthermore, I think it would not be hard to find a place (ix. 26) where Aldus soars above all MSS and printed editions and displays his own knowledge of Greek. I have in mind to make a special study of all the Greek passages in the 1508 Pliny at another time. Some unnecessary departures from what seem to be ten-book readings in favor of the  $\varsigma$  editions are the following:

- 38.13 *μεγαλοφρονότατος* Ber. a  
 52.8 *μεσόχορος* Cat. a  
 55.17 *qui suspensus et tabulatus* Cat. ai. [I am here assuming that Budaeus as well as Aldus took this reading from Catanaeus]  
 57.17 *diaeta* Ber. a  
 60.23 *permovetur* Laet. a  
 71.27 *vitam finisse* Cat. a  
 101.22 *εὐσχήμως* Ber. a  
 114.3 *maiorem annis lx ocio* Cat. a  
 117.12 *Cassii* Cat. a

It would be difficult to see on what grounds anyone could urge that the following readings were taken by Aldus from P; Keil and Merrill have rejected them and, furthermore, the two remaining families of MSS read otherwise.

- 21.4 *minutius* Dmra  
 21.8 *minutius* Dora  
 21.9 *enim om.* Dma.  
 23.13 *et om.* ouxpa  
 35.24 *tutor mihi ouxpra*  
 45.15 *proconsul* Doa  
 47.7 *mihi tantum ouxpra*  
 47.26 *fortiterque ouxpra*  
 56.20 *est terra uxpra*  
 58.20 *gravissima* oa

The foregoing lists are based on a study of the critical apparatus of the Teubner editions of 1870 and 1922. These lists, not exhaustive but merely illustrative, seem to indicate that Aldus did not follow P as carefully as he might have done and that he resorted to the earlier editions at times when P offered a satisfactory text. Surely it cannot be maintained that all these readings and others like them were in P; in that event our estimate of that MS would depreciate considerably. I feel, therefore, that Professor Rand is not justified in assuming here and there in his studies that Aldine readings with little or no support were taken from P. Doubtless many P-readings are preserved in the 1508 Aldine Pliny, but we cannot be sure in any given case that a particular reading was found in P, simply because it occurs in Aldus' text. This, I think, is precisely what Professor Merrill meant when he said: . . . *Codex praestantissimus evanuit, neque lectiones eius ex editione Aldina restitui possunt.* . . .<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Praefatio*, p. xiii. Teubner, 1922.

I am greatly interested in Professor Rand's contemplated study of all unsupported Aldine readings in the *Letters*. With regard to the readings in this paper, however, of which some have slight MS support, while others rest solely on printed editions, I do not see how he can produce convincing evidence that Aldus followed P. If we cannot trust Aldus in one place, how can we trust him wholeheartedly in another?

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
ST. LOUIS, MO.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

---

ĒSSE, "TO EAT"

In 1915 I published in *Classical Philology* (X, 315) a paper controverting F. Vollmer's view that the long vowel was an invention of the Latin grammarians. As no reference was made to this paper by Vollmer in his last discussion of the subject (*Glotta*, XI [1921], 221 ff.), and as owing to the circumstances of the time my paper appeared in *Classical Philology* without being corrected in proof, I wish to draw attention to the fact that I have embodied the necessary amplifications and corrections of it in a contribution to the current volume of *Glotta* (XIV, 107-9).

CAMBRIDGE  
April 11, 1925

J. P. POSTGATE

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*The Rise of the Greek Epic.* By GILBERT MURRAY. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Third Edition.

The many readers who have taken delight in Professor Murray's vivid imaginative picture of the conditions that he fancies gave rise to the Greek epic will deprecate any animadversions on the scholarship or the logic of so fascinating a book as criticism of the type that he himself attributes to the reviewer who can think of nothing but his dissent from the footnote on page 431. He himself says in the Preface to the third edition that he has elsewhere said what I thought I said in a review of the earlier edition<sup>1</sup> that the method of analysis employed cannot for lack of sufficient evidence show us what happened but only "the kind of thing that must (I said 'might') have happened." It is agreed, then, that no one can either prove or disprove the unity of Homer. But to that safe generalization I would add two qualifications. First, the burden of proof rests on those who deny the essential unity of authorship of poems more harmonious and more like one another than any other poems in world-literature. Second, it is entirely demonstrable that every disintegrating analysis of the Homeric poems hitherto published rests its arguments largely not only on bad logic, but on misinterpretation of the texts. Professor Murray deprecates this way of argument as controversy, which he says he avoids, naively adding to show his freedom from the controversial spirit "these stalwarts do not wish to be persuaded or argued with." His own subtler method of controversy is the perpetual suggestion that the unitarians are reactionary sentimentalists who regard concessions to reason as dangerous (p. vi), who are reluctant to look facts in the face (p. 177), who are "curiously bitter in controversy," who regard analytic criticism as "a wicked outrage on poetry," who are "vehement," "indignant," and somewhat absurdly agitated by the calm, scientific procedure of the rational critic. To all these plausible and effective generalizations the present unitarian reviewer has only one reply. The arguments of the disintegrationists are largely based on demonstrable misinterpretations of the text of which additional examples will be supplied as soon as there is any attempt to defend and justify those already cited. Professor Murray never attempts anything of the kind. Instead, for example, of replying to Professor Scott's specific arguments he merely says, "Professor Scott has ably argued, etc." . . . "but has carried his own method I fear to still more fallacious conclusions." His Preface refers to my article on the logic of the Homeric simile.<sup>2</sup> But he actually reprints without change the entire

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Class. Phil.*, VI, 238.

<sup>2</sup> *Class. Phil.*, XVII, 240.

argument based on the misunderstanding there pointed out of the Homeric similes including the hopeless confusion of the wasp simile in M 167 ff. with that in II 259 ff. He still says that *aidōs* is predominantly pity for the weak and helpless, "social compunction" the socialists call it, that Plato's hostility to democracy made *aidōs* of little significance in his thought, that the main thing which philosophers got from *aidōs* was Aristotle's doctrine of the mean. He reads *aidōs* into Hesiod's *Works and Days*, 327 ff., taking it apparently from 324 where it refers to shamelessness in the pursuit of gain, κέρδος. He still cuts out "inorganic" lines to the destruction of the sense, the logic, and the Homeric style. He implies that ὑπόσχεσις is the Homeric word for "vow" and can be so translated in passages where it clearly means something else. In quoting Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 151 to prove that Hesiod "thinks of iron in connection with work rather than fighting" he omits the first half of the preceding line τῶν [τοῖς] δ' ἦν κάλκεα μὲν τεύχεα. He translates εἴ μοι κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων ἤπια εἰδείη "if only Agamemnon would seek his friendship and offer him amends," with no hint that other interpretations have been proposed and may be justified. And though he now says that ὀλολυγή was not a mere cry of sorrow he still in *Odyssey* iii. 421 ff. takes it as a cry for frightening away evil influences from the stream of our brother's sacred life." But I must not elaborate these slight, though not altogether insignificant, illustrations into a systematic examination of the methods of disintegrating critics. If I were to select any book as a corpus vile for that tedious exercise it would be Wilamowitz' *Iliad* and not a book which in spite of my dissent I have always read with so much pleasure as this. I have chosen examples that can be easily tested.

Objections to the logic and the literary criticism can always be disputed as matters of opinion. And yet what can one make of the reasoning that in the fact that Pindar's long fourth Pythian bursts the natural bounds of the ode finds confirmation of the theory that the *Iliad* is a lay which, by secular accretion, has utterly outgrown its natural boundaries, or that sees in the blundering substitution of νήδυμος for γήδυμος in our text evidence that the meaning of fair-sounding Homeric words was far from clear to the poets themselves who used them?

Professor Murray thinks of himself throughout as the calm advocate of critical science and sweet reasonableness. He hears the threatening voices of the lions in his path but will not strive or cry "but merely try gradually to make them friends to man." Yet, oddly enough, not only is his own logic a perpetual defiance to reason, but by some fatality he is always most interested in the weirdest German paradoxes of the Mùlders and the Dümmlers (Hector, a Boeotian!) and always finds himself in most cordial agreement with such irrationalists as Verrall, Mr. Cornford, and Miss Jane Harrison. But he is always interesting, and what more would you have in a drab and pedantic world?

PAUL SHOREY

*Lexicon Plautinum* conscripsit GONZALEZ LODGE. Voluminis primi fasciculorum I et II impressio correcta. Voluminis primi fasciculus X (ultimus) *Ita-Lysidamus*. Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1924.

Professor Lodge has completed the first volume of his lexicon in this new instalment, apparently about half of the entire work. The latest fascicle contains a Preface and a new list of *opera citata*, a list of *addenda* from Lindsay's Oxford text and other sources, a few additional citations supplementing the earlier fascicles, and a list of *corrigenda*. A convenient summary of the *vocabula Punica* in the *Poenulus* by Professor Gottheil concludes the fascicle.

In addition a corrected imprint of the first two fascicles of the volume is furnished to replace those already published. Apparently similar corrected impressions of later fascicles have not been found necessary.

To earlier reviews of this work it is sufficient to add that, as Professor Lodge implies in the Latin preface to the tenth fascicle, the only error in this invaluable work is an error in *meliozem partem*, the lavish citations of MSS and emendations. It would be difficult to overestimate the service rendered to students of Plautus by this careful and complete assembling of Plautine diction.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*The Achievement of Greece: A Chapter in Human Experience.* By WILLIAM CHASE GREENE, PH.D. Harvard University Press, 1923. Pp. 334.

Nowadays to write a readable book on Ancient Greece is to contribute to the welcome literature of escape from the enslaving drive of our modern world into a *terra incognita* where life is more simple and reposeful. Professor Greene's book ought to be at least as interesting as a South Sea tale or a wild-west romance; for it pictures a people who not only live rather happily without motor cars, radiographs, and Rotary conventions but who lived even richly long before the "era of progress," and wrought out of the primitive conditions of their existence a world of beauty, of wisdom, and of that rare balance between the extremes of living which we call the "golden mean."

Professor Greene writes with the conviction that Ancient Greece holds a treasury of experience which we do well to draw upon and use in our own lives, and is throughout his book at pains to point contrasts and the lessons to be drawn from them. He seems to forget that President Eliot warned us a few years ago that we have little to learn from Ancient Greece because our own civilization has been organized into so vast a complex as to be unable to profit from the study of a society so limited and so simple as that of the



Greek city-state. Indeed he feels, as most of us do, that the best place to study and comprehend human nature is not amid the confusing complexities, the artificialities, nay, the hypocrisies of present-day life but in that ancient stage where, in a society which was still "the individual writ large," men played their parts, if not always with distinction and honor, at any rate with unmasked, and therefore intelligible, sincerity.

The scope of the book is indicated by the headings of the chapters: "Ancient Greece and the Modern World"; "The Background of Greek Life: Geography"; "The Greeks in History"; "Daily Life"; "The Finding of Beauty"; "Individual and Society"; "Man and the Universe"; "The Meaning of Humanism." There is also a Bibliography for the general reader and a convenient Index.

Necessarily in a single volume covering so much ground, the treatment is very general. It is an admirable summing up of the significant results of detailed scholarship to those who have already some knowledge of the field; there is a studious avoidance of the temptation to tell half-truths; and the judgments pronounced on controversial matters are uniformly temperate and sane. However, the book is obviously addressed to the general reader, and one may fairly raise the question whether the author might not have done better for the public which he has in mind had he even less comprehension in his scope and filled in his sketch with more detail and color. The layman would undoubtedly get more out of the book were it less abstract.

Since Professor Greene has in this work entered the field with such interpreters of Greek civilization as Butcher, Gilbert Murray, Livingstone, and Dickinson, he invites comment upon his style. This is almost uniformly readable—clear, sober, and restrained. The reader will feel grateful to an author who takes pains to express exactly what he means—no more, no less—even if there be lacking the imaginative phrase which floods the page with light. Only twice does the author break through the restraint of a studied sobriety of expression, once when his memory of a Greek landscape almost betrays him into poetry, and again when his enthusiasm for Horace discloses itself in the one rhetorical passage of the book.

It must be said that the style is not uniformly even. The discussion of the "Forerunners of the Greeks" is a model of clarity and succinctness, while the review of the long course of Greek history from the earliest time to our own day reads jerkily—too much like a notebook. For example:

In Ionia, the cities revolted. Of course the revolt was unsuccessful; but the old capital of Lydia, Sardis, was burned. Nor was it only the Greeks of Asia Minor that were involved. The Spartans, to be sure, true to their home-keeping, cautious traditions, had refused to have anything to do with such a harebrained expedition; but Athens, always ready for adventure, had helped to singe the beard of the Great King of Persia.

There are also occasional infelicities of phrase such as "then policy would have let matters slide," but these are very exceptional and it is almost

ungracious to mention them at all when the book, as a whole, because of its accuracy and breadth of scholarship and well-balanced judgment throughout, deserves our warm congratulations.

GEORGE NORLIN

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

---

*Architecture*. By ALFRED MANSFIELD BROOKS. "Our Debt to Greece and Rome Series." Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1924.

Much has been written on Greek and Roman architecture by writers of varied nationality, some of great, others of indifferent, ability. To our knowledge, none of these commentaries has been listed in "the month's best sellers," and many are very dull.

Only a courageous author would attempt the subject for today's public, tuned to jazz and sensationalism. It is inherently difficult to popularize a form of art which passed into history some two thousand years ago, of which modern copies were dead when they were conceived, and doubly so when the writer foregoes the help of illustrations; but this is evidently the purpose of Alfred Mansfield Brooks, author of *Architecture*, and the book is patently propaganda for the cult of "Our debt to Greece and Rome."

Materials and the physical qualities of the buildings are described and the classic orders explained in understandable English, avoiding, as far as possible, technical terms, but with no emphasis on and scarce mention of proportion—that delicate quality which makes Doric, Doric, and not Ionic—the poetry and refinement of scale, or the wonderful play of light and shade.

For instance, we are told how many diameters high the columns are but nothing of their all-important spacing. The book was written for pupils and the laity, not for architects, and it is unfair for an architect to comment, but it would be interesting to know just what impression one who had never seen Greece or Rome, or pictures of their buildings, would get from the reading.

The chapter on Athens describes the buildings on the acropolis, with a bit of history, and, together with that on Rome, forms the best part of the volume. The tracing of the influence of the classic on architecture of today, when it is simply as the alphabet is to literature, is covered in outline in the later chapters. The references to examples of modern "classic" are amusing, particularly of a notable skyscraper where the huge granite columns carry nothing but their massive selves, and the honesty of purpose of Greek art is tossed into the discard.

In spite of the charm which architecture per se has for almost everyone, its histories are poor reading, which in this instance is too bad, for "Our debt to Greece and Rome" is real, and pitifully forgotten.

H. V. D. S.

CHICAGO

*Cicero, The Speeches* (with an English translation): *Pro Archia Poeta—Post Reditum in Senatu—Post Reditum ad Quirites—De Domo Sua—De Haruspicum Responsis—Pro Plancio*. By N. H. WATTS. Loeb Classical Library. 16mo. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923. Pp. vii+551. \$2.50.

This volume, now nearly two years old, is Number 158 in the Loeb Classical Library. The series, now almost fully grown, has brought many old friends to us in guises new and sometimes strange, but always welcome. Some of the translations are free and happy; some are strictly literal and fettered. This volume of Tully's *Speeches* presents a translation that is at once accurate and true, but somehow it fails to satisfy. It retains the great orator's wonderful periods but it loses his majestic sweep and power. The language of the English version is, in the main, well chosen and clear, but occasionally we are brought face to face with a sentence like this (p. 163):

Was the assignment of the consular provinces, which Gaius Gracchus, the unique example of an extreme democrat, not only did not take away from the senate, but even enacted by legislation were year by year to be assigned through the senate, annulled by you after it had been decreed by the senate in accordance with the Semonian law; . . .

or this (p. 205):

Or, on the other hand, while I had no danger to apprehend from a trial, did I dread legislation against my person, for fear lest no veto might be interposed if it should be proposed to inflict a fine upon me, being at the time present?

Misprints are rare, but unfortunate when they take such a form as "*Sulibus Iudicandis*" (p. 226).

WALTER MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

